

5-2017

Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises

Randi M. Combs

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Agricultural Economics Commons](#), [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Cultural Resource Management and Policy Analysis Commons](#), and the [Indigenous Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Combs, Randi M., "Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises" (2017). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1962.

<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/1962>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option
for Native American Tribal Enterprises

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Food Science

by

Randi M. Combs
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, and Criminal Justice, 2008
Northeastern State University
Bachelor of Arts in English, 2009
Northeastern State University
Master of Science in Library Media and Information Technology, 2013

May 2017
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Kelly Way
Dissertation Director

Dr. Rhonda Hammond
Committee Member

Dr. Ed Bengtson
Committee Member

Dr. Han-Seok Seo
Committee Member

Dr. Zola Moon
Committee Member

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation. Specifically, issues of business diversification, marketing, perceived barriers to success, potential benefits to the tribe, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage were considered. A modified mixed-methods exploratory sequential research model was used to collect and organize data in two phases. *Phase 1* quantitative data was used to inform the development of a *Phase 2* qualitative interview protocol. *Phase 1* found a significant relationship between a higher income level and a lower perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry for tribal entities. Additionally, respondents with an acculturation rating of Bicultural were found to have a higher perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry than those rated as Assimilated. In relation to marketing tribal winery products, the safest categories for marketing consideration were geography, animals, and tribal writing. Ceremonial dress and historic figures were rated as neutral, and totems were rated as unacceptable. Finally, perceived viability of a tribally operated winery in respondents' own tribe and the perceived viability of a tribally operated winery in tribes other than respondents were compared to respondents' average perception of barriers and benefits. A significant positive relationship was found between respondents' perceived viability of a winery within their own tribe and their perception of the benefits a winery could offer. A significant negative relationship was found between respondents' perceived viability of a winery within their own tribe and their perception of the barriers to inception. For tribes other than respondents' own, a higher perceived viability of a winery had a significant positive relationship with the perception of the benefits to winery operation. *Phase 2* qualitative interviews followed to elaborate on the various aspects of each of these areas of consideration.

©2017 by Randi Combs
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

Over the course of this project, I have had the pleasure to work with many talented, passionate individuals. Through their strong examples, I have developed personally and professionally. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Kelly Way. Though she was a late addition to my dissertation committee, she truly embodies the caring, intellect, and diligence of a master mentor.

I would like to thank my committee members, who span three departments and two universities, for always making themselves available to me as my research progressed. Dr. Hammond's valuable insight on cultural marketing led to this research concept, and our Type A connection created a harmonious working relationship! Dr. Bengtson served as both a consistent, positive source of support and as a top notch qualitative research mentor and advisor. In unceasing patience, he helped me to conceptualize (and re-conceptualize, and re-conceptualize...) my idea in a way that could be addressed despite the roadblocks I encountered. Dr. Seo served as a dependable advisor as I worked to meet departmental requirements, and Dr. Moon lent her considerable expertise to the development of my quantitative methodology in order to ensure a synergy with the more prominent qualitative portion.

I cannot end this portion without acknowledging the many long hours that my fellow PhD student, Dylan Martinez, spent with me on various projects over the past four years. His contrasting, heavily analytic skill set complemented my sociological, language-based approach. The university will be a poorer place without our collaboration!

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my wonderful and patient husband Lonnie, our beautiful children Ariadne, Leith, and Aurelia, my fantastic mother, and my close friends. Without you all, I would not have been able to complete this degree program. I do not take for granted the support, encouragement, and kind words from each of you as you helped me navigate the challenges of maintaining work-life balance, motivated me to press on when encountering unexpected roadblocks, and generally reinforced in me the idea that I am pursuing an avenue of which we can all be proud.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Purpose of Study	3
Problem Statement	3
Research Questions	4
Hypotheses	5
Delimitations, Assumptions, and Limitations	7
Summary	8
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	9
Native American Acculturation Scale	11
Preserving Tribal Heritage	13
Cultural Identification and Wine	16
Motivations	17
Challenges	18
Heritage	18
American Viticultural Area	19
Wineries and Business Structure	19
Tribal Business Diversification	20
Native Agriculture	22
Consumer Behavior	24
Native American Consumers	25
Marketing and Culture	27
Wine Packaging/Labeling	28
Barriers to Success	31
Social Identity Theory	32
Chapter 3: Methodology	33
Research Design	33
Population and Sampling Method	34
Phase 1: Quantitative	34
Phase 2: Qualitative	34

Data Collection Techniques	35
Instrument.....	36
Validity and Reliability	38
Content Validity.....	38
Reliability.....	38
Data Analysis	39
Phase 1: Quantitative	39
Phase 2: Qualitative	41
Delimitations, Assumptions, and Limitations	43
Research Questions	44
Hypotheses	45
Chapter 4: Findings	47
Results and Discussion.....	47
Phase 1 Response Rate.....	48
Phase 1 Respondent Profile.....	49
Phase 2 Respondent Profile.....	55
Research Questions	57
Research Question 1: Quantitative Analysis.....	58
Hypothesis 1.....	58
Hypothesis 3.....	60
Hypothesis 4.....	64
Hypothesis 6.....	67
Research Question 1: Qualitative Analysis	69
Business Diversification	69
Supporting Other Existing Tribal Businesses	69
Applying Tribal Resources	72
Land Issues.....	74
Matters of State and the US Wine Market	78
Being New/Novel.....	80
Perceived Benefits of Tribal Winery Operation	81
Increased Tribal Revenue	82

Keeping the Tribal Community Close	82
Employment Opportunities	83
Establishing the Presence of Native Americans in the Modern Era	84
Perceived Barriers to Success of Tribally Owned Wineries	85
Social Resistance	85
Stereotypes Concerning Native Americans	88
Resources and Delayed Gratification.....	90
Authenticity.....	92
The Role of Agriculture in the Preservation of Tribal Heritage	94
Tribal History.....	94
Preservation of Heritage	95
Preservation of Land	96
Research Question 2: Quantitative Analysis	98
Hypothesis 2.....	98
Research Question 2: Qualitative Analysis	100
Marketing.....	100
Geography	100
Ceremonial Dress.....	102
Native American Historic Figures	104
Animals	105
Totems.....	107
Writing in a Tribal Language.....	110
Meaningful Tribal Objects.....	112
Research Question 3: Quantitative Analysis	115
Hypothesis 5.....	115
Research Question 3: Qualitative Analysis	125
Potential Negatives	125
Wine and the Market.....	127
Tribal Considerations.....	129
Chapter 5: Discussion and Recommendations	132
Discussion	135

Current Perceptions.....	135
Hypothesis 1.....	135
Hypothesis 3.....	135
Hypothesis 4.....	136
Hypothesis 6.....	137
Qualitative Analysis.....	138
Marketing Tribal Winery Products	139
Hypothesis 2.....	139
Qualitative Analysis.....	140
Perceived Future of Native-owned Wineries	143
Hypothesis 5.....	143
Qualitative Analysis.....	145
Conclusions	147
Strengths	147
Challenges	148
Opportunities.....	149
Recommendations	151
References	153
Appendix A: Phase 1 IRB Approval	158
Appendix B: Phase 1 Qualtrics Survey	163
Appendix C: Phase 2 IRB Approval	184
Appendix D: Phase 2 Non-Involved Interview Protocol	186

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to explore the unexamined relationship between two prominent entities – Native Americans and the US Wine Industry. In the United States, there are 566 federally recognized Native American tribes spread out over half of the country (National Conference of State Legislators, 2015). Also prevalent in the United States is the production of wine, which is made in every state (Stevenson, 2011). Native Americans began to enter the modern wine industry in 1968, with the Osooyos Indian Band of British Columbia being the first to plant wine grapes (Kettman, 2013). The US wine industry has enjoyed consistent sales growth, slowed only during the economic recession of 2008 and 2009 (Statista, 2016), with California and Texas among the top wine producers and consumers. California and Texas, along with Oklahoma, also have the three largest shares of Native American buying power, totaling about 20.8 billion dollars last year (Miller, 2015).

Despite the prevalence and power of both Native Americans and the United States wine industry, no research has yet been conducted on any facet of their relationship. The present research will begin to build a foundation that will be useful for future researchers and industry practitioners alike. There are multiple points of the interaction between Native American individuals, Native American businesses, and the wine industry that beg examination of this emerging phenomenon. This gap in the current wine research exists despite tribal populations being centralized in the same states as the majority of US wine sales. Study of modern Native American individuals' perception of the wine industry and the implications of these perceptions on potential business opportunities could prove integral to the success of a tribe as they move toward this option. Following in the footsteps of other wine researchers working with minority

populations (Velikova, Wilkinson, & Harp, 2016; Hammond, Sydnor, & Kang, 2014), the present research works to illuminate the underserved sectors in the United States wine market. It is important to fill this gap in the literature through examination of wine-related perceptions of Native Americans, because they are a powerful consumer force in high impact wine production areas, as well as the current or potential investors or workers in newly emerging Native-owned wine businesses. The negative circumstances that shaped Native Americans' experience a generation ago - the poverty, poor health, and cultural disintegration - have improved with casino-generated wealth (Garrigues, 2012), but it would be negligent to suggest that the recency and scope of these experiences should not be considered in the examination of Native Americans' perceptions of tribally owned wineries.

In general, information from this research is of significance to future academic researchers and industry practitioners alike. Addressing a gap in the current research knowledge and providing information from which future researchers can build additional relevant explorations is the primary academic purpose of the current research. For industry relevance, these studies provide data about potential interactions between factors that comprise the Native American experience with wine and the wine industry. Such information is valuable in terms of reaching out to this underserved but increasingly powerful consumer demographic and determining the feasibility of wine-related business ventures in tribal diversification plans.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation. Specifically, issues of business diversification, marketing, perceived barriers to success, potential benefits to the tribe, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage will be considered.

Problem Statement

There is a need to diversify business interests in federally recognized tribes as they seek to support their membership. A small selection of the 566 federally recognized tribes have moved toward diversification through winery operation, but this opportunity has yet to garner consideration or support in the majority of tribes despite the strength and growth of the United States wine industry. The lack of existing literature on the subject, coupled with the reality of pressing tribal financial needs, indicates the practical and academic value of the present research. A modified mixed-methods exploratory sequential model is used to examine the perceptions of tribal members who are not currently involved in winery operation. This study will provide information through which suggestions for interventions, education, or basic strategic planning decisions can be made as new tribes consider this diversification option.

Research Questions

The designation of “non-involved” was created to provide clarity to the research questions. Non-involved individuals are members of federally recognized tribes who do not currently have a role in the wine industry.

1. What are non-involved tribal participants’ current perceptions of tribally owned winery operations?
2. What are the perceptions of non-involved Native American individuals toward the use of Native American icons or symbols on tribally owned winery products for marketing purposes?
3. How do non-involved Native American participants perceive the future of tribal winery operations?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perceptions of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perception of benefits of entry in non-involved participants.

Hypothesis 2:

Non-involved participants will rate acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced wine products on a Likert scale as a measure of less than neutral.

Hypothesis 3:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Women will rate overall perceived barriers as higher than men.
- B. Overall perceived barriers will be parallel to participants' age.
- C. Participants with lower education will have a higher perception of overall barriers.
- D. Higher income will be related to a lower overall perception of barriers.

Hypothesis 4:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived benefits to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Men will rate overall perceived benefits higher than women.

- B. Overall perceived benefits will be inversely related to participants' age.
- C. Participants with higher education will have a higher perception of overall benefits.
- D. Higher income will be related to a higher overall perception of benefits.

Hypothesis 5:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perceived viability of tribal winery operations.

Hypothesis 6:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation.

- A. Those with an acculturation score of "Bicultural," "Assimilated," or "Pantraditional" will have a lower perception of perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry.
- B. Those with an acculturation score of "Traditional" or "Marginal" will have a lower perception of perceived benefits of entry into the wine industry.

Delimitations, Assumptions, and Limitations

For this study, delimitations were set for research questions and population. While the researcher acknowledges the potentially vast nature of thoroughly exploring the relationship of Native Americans and the US Wine Industry, consideration in this project has been given to business diversification, Native American symbols and icons as used in packaging and marketing, perceived barriers to success, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage. Further, this relationship will be examined from Native American individuals' points of view.

In performing this research, it is assumed that participants were open, honest, and accurate in their responses. Representatives of all 566 federally recognized tribes were not available for participation, so it is assumed that the responses received provide knowledge that is valuable and transferable to other Native American populations. Finally, it is assumed that participants answer both the survey questionnaire and the interview protocol in a manner that is thorough and representative of their perspectives.

Potential limitations include the inability to gain full access to all federally recognized tribes in the United States and the degree to which knowledge gained is potentially transferable between tribal enterprises. The respondent profile of the quantitative portion is an additional limitation, as access to tribal individuals willing to both fill out the survey and participate in a follow-up qualitative interview is not fully representative of the diverse views of tribal members across the nation. Data collected through the online survey portion of this research may be skewed by virtue of the digital delivery method. A limitation in coding the qualitative data is the use of an assumptive framework, and finally, the researcher must take whatever data the participants are willing to offer during the interview process. The voices of representatives of

tribes who currently operate wineries are not heard in this project, as no participants agreed to participate in the in-depth interviews required to address their side of the story.

Summary

Native Americans are a powerful consumer force that have shown substantial growth by more than quadrupling spending power since 1990 (Miller, 2015). The concentration of these consumer forces, attributed to an increase in the general population and Native-owned businesses (The Selig Center, 2010), occur in areas that are also large players in the wine industry such as Texas and California (Stevenson, 2011). Decreased growth in tribal gaming means that tribes are looking for diversification opportunities, with some expanding tribal operations by entering the wine industry (Kettman, 2013). Native Americans' involvement in the United States wine industry, both individually and in business capacities, has yet to be explored by researchers. The present research begins the process of exploring these relationships and building a collection of knowledge that will be useful to both academics and industry practitioners.

CHAPTER 2:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Like the wine industry, Indian gaming revenue has increased steadily for the past decade, with the exception of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, where revenue held steady at \$26.5 billion dollars (National Indian Gaming Commission, 2014). In a typical commercial gaming setting, such as Las Vegas, Tunica, or Atlantic City, about 50% of revenue is generated through gaming, and the other 50% is generated through hotel bookings, food and beverage sales, and entertainment (Red-Horse, 2006). In tribal commercial settings, however, 80-90% of revenue is generated through slot machine activity alone (Red-Horse, 2006). Allocation of revenue from commercial tribal gaming is regulated by the Indian Gaming Revenue Act, and must be used to meet the needs of the tribe in terms of improving infrastructure, developing educational opportunities, and providing social programs for tribal members (Robertson, 2012). Gaming revenue provides opportunities for tribal self-determination, i.e. local decision-making, and is very important to the future of Native American communities (Stevens, 2015). Wilson (2013) notes that tribes are experiencing an increase in gaming industry competition, which is a direct challenge to the need for tribal revenues to further improve members' quality of life. In 2015, the slowed growth rate of tribal gaming was a popular topic of discussion for economists. In his annual economic report, Meister (2015) reported that tribal gaming growth has slowed, likely due to market maturation, and Freiss (2015) discussed both the effects of market saturation and increased competition on tribal revenue and identified a shift toward diversification in tribal portfolios.

In 1968, the Osooyos Indian Band of British Columbia became the first Native American tribe in modern times to grow wine grapes, with 1200 acres of vines from which they supply

other producers and their own brand (Kettman, 2013). In the United States, Native American involvement in the wine industry is a much more recent phenomenon. Members of the Lumbee tribe in South Carolina started Native Vines Winery in 1998, and they claim to be the first Native-owned winery in the US (Gabbard, 2015). Twelve years later in 2010, the Yacapai-Apache Nation started Fire Mountain Wines in Arizona (Kettman, 2013), and was followed into the industry in 2012 by the Lytton Band, the Dry Creek Band, and the Yocha-Dehe Wintun Nation, who were the first Native Americans in California to release their wines under their own label (Kettman, 2013). A small force of Native-owned operations have begun to crop up and tribal elders have identified a need to educate their members, who form the primary workforce, on the wine-making business, wine cellars, and tasting room (Garrigues, 2012). The educational component and the ventures themselves are both important because vineyards can be used as an additional attraction to gaming establishments, and there is significant pride of ownership in tribal members as they cultivate and connect with the land (Garrigues, 2012). This is a very different situation than tribes found themselves in a generation ago, when many tribal members faced poverty, disease, and cultural disintegration (Garrigues, 2012). Through casino-generated wealth, tribes have enjoyed many opportunities for health, education, and cultural revival (Garrigues, 2012). In 1990, Native American consumer spending totaled \$20 billion dollars, a number that more than quadrupled by 2014, with \$83 billion dollars spent (Miller, 2015). A multicultural economy report from The Selig Center (2010) posits that this massive increase in Native American buying power is supported by rapid population growth and growth in the number of Native-owned businesses. These factors likely played an important role in these economic changes; however, the present research will focus exclusively on Native-owned businesses.

Native-owned businesses have been feeling pressured by economic forecasts to seek diversification and are making a slow move into the wine industry. There is a definite gap in the literature in terms of examining the experiences of these businesses – the motivations, challenges, and benefits – that is important to address. As tribal gaming revenue growth has been steadily declining, these early entrants will serve as a hopeful example or cautionary tale for other tribes seeking to similarly diversify. Additionally, generating information about Native-owned wineries will help potential investors to prepare if they decide to take this avenue of diversification.

Since tribes already invest heavily in a variety of hospitality operations and use these investments to provide jobs for tribal members, it makes sense that Native American individuals are heavily involved in hospitality careers. According to the US Census Bureau (2014), 25.6% of Native Americans work in service jobs, an occurrence that is 9.2% more frequent than their Caucasian counterparts. Native Americans comprise 3% of the United States population (Census, 2014), but they are consistently excluded from wine industry trend samples. The rapidly increasing consumer buying power of Native Americans is an important indicator that the group should be taken seriously in terms of their economic impact. Increased representation in wine trend samples is needed, because Native Americans are heavily involved in both service and hospitality operations related to the wine industry.

Acculturation and Signifiers in the

Native American Acculturation Scale (Garret & Pichette, 2000)

Acculturation can be described as “a process of giving up one’s traditional cultural values and behaviors while taking on the values and behaviors of the dominant social structure”

(Atkinson et al., 1995, p. 131). Native Americans are unique as a cultural group, because the population is comprised of many distinct tribes across the country who historically have each faced varying degrees of forced assimilation. It can be tricky business to assign a value to nebulous ideas such as cultural identity. For the present study, a validated measure has been adopted from academic research in multicultural counseling. In a counseling setting, an acculturation scale is useful to understand the worldview of the patient and adapt treatment appropriately and has been used by previous researchers in the qualitative examination of both African American and Hispanic wine consumers (Hammond et al., 2014; Velikova et al., 2016). Acculturation has proven an important concept in determining cross-cultural experiential differences and the degree to which these differences impact consumer experience. In the present research, acculturation is an important measure because, unlike the immigrants generally studied in consumer acculturation, Native Americans have lived and developed side-by-side with mainstream culture in the United States for many generations. Historical experiences such as forced assimilation and widespread poverty, followed by gaming-generated wealth and recent cultural revival (Garrigues, 2012), are indicators of the complexity of this population and their collective experience.

The Native American acculturation scale assesses individuals and assigns a score that corresponds to one of the following categories: Traditional, Marginal, Bicultural, Assimilated, and Pantraditional (Garret & Pichette, 2000). These signifiers are defined by the authors with the following level descriptions (Garret & Pichette, 2000, p. 78).

1. *Traditional*: May or may not speak English, but generally speak and think in their native language; hold only traditional values and beliefs and practice only traditional tribal customs and methods of worship.

2. *Marginal*: May speak both the native language and English; may not, however, fully accept the cultural heritage and practices of their tribal group nor fully identify with mainstream cultural values and behaviors.
 3. *Bicultural*: Generally accepted by dominant society and tribal society/nation; simultaneously able to know, accept, and practice both mainstream values/behaviors and the traditional values and beliefs of their cultural heritage.
 4. *Assimilated*: Accepted by dominant society; embrace only mainstream cultural values, behaviors, and expectations.
 5. *Pantraditional*: Assimilated Native Americans who have made conscious choice to return to the “old ways.” They are generally accepted by dominant society but seek to embrace previously lost traditional cultural values, beliefs, and practices of their tribal heritage. Therefore, they may speak both English and their native tribal language.
- (Compiled from Herring, 1996; LaFromboise, Trimble, & Mohatt, 1990, p. 638.)

Preserving Tribal Heritage

It is important when speaking of Native American culture to understand both the current and historic climate in which these efforts have developed, and the paths traveled through government legislation and grassroots efforts. Preservation of tribal culture and heritage, while often a priority for tribes at the local level, has recently experienced a surge in publicity as a result of the protests over the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL). This controversial construction saw the testimony of former tribal historic preservation officer Tim Mentz, Sr., in Washington, D.C. District Court to “report that the area that lay in the path...holds 82 cultural features and 27 graves” two days before “DAPL construction workers graded the area” (Colwell, 2016). These

actions, after a long and turbulent history of Native American and government relations, led to intense and well-publicized protests and President Obama's eventual denial of permits for the last leg of construction (Maher & Connors, 2016). While the ultimate fate of this project remains uncertain, it has certainly resulted in increased awareness and recognition of indigenous people's efforts of cultural preservation and revitalization.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended through 1992 impacts funding and policy concerning tribal lands and culture. The full act is defined on the government website as seen below (National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 2016).

AN ACT to Establish a Program for the Preservation of Additional Historic Properties throughout the Nation, and for Other Purposes, Approved October 15, 1966 (Public Law 89-665; 80 STAT.915; 16 U.S.C. 470) as amended by Public Law 91-243, Public Law 93-54, Public Law 94-422, Public Law 94-458, Public Law 96-199, Public Law 96-244, Public Law 96-515, Public Law 98-483, Public Law 99-514, Public Law 100-127, and Public Law 102-575.

In FY2016, the National Historic Preservation Fund provided over half a million dollars in grants to 16 Native American tribes "to support the protection of America's native cultures" (Tribal Historic Preservation Office Grant Program, 2016). These grants are provided through authorization from the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and take the following form (THPOGP, 2016).

These grants assist Indian Tribes, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiian Organizations in protecting and promoting their unique cultural heritage and traditions. From the beginning, the program has been shaped by Indian tribes. It focuses on what they are most concerned with protecting – Native language, oral history, plant and animal species important in tradition, sacred and historic places, and the establishment of tribal historic preservation offices. Since 1990, more than \$17 million has been awarded to over 460 Indian and Alaskan Native Communities.

By providing the means with which Native communities can pursue preservation efforts, this federal act and resultant funding play an important part in facilitating tribal preservation. The formation of preservation offices mentioned by the grant program are another important

component through which these goals are facilitated.

The National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (NATHPO) are individuals who are selected by a federally-recognized tribe to oversee a formal plan approved by the National Park Service (National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, 2016). Approved Tribal historic preservation plans have “emphasized the importance of the oral tradition, as well as consulting Tribal elders and spiritual leaders with special knowledge of the Tribe’s tradition. They also have given emphasis to the importance of protecting ‘traditional cultural properties,’ ...[which are] rooted in the history of the community and are important to maintaining...traditional beliefs and practices” (NATHPO, 2016). These officers provide important functions within their respective tribes, including overseeing the execution of preservation plans and maintaining actions true to the cultural values of the tribe, as well as cooperating with local governments to form these programs, educating the public, and providing information and training as it relates to cultural preservation (NATHPO, 2016).

These funding sources and appointed officers also work closely with local communities on existing tribal preservation efforts. While not all preservation efforts are supported by sources of external funding from the National Historic Preservation Act, they are no less vital to tribal cultural revitalization efforts. An example of a widely-supported community program is the Cherokee Nation Immersion School in Tahlequah, OK. This school addresses state learning standards with students in pre-school through sixth grade (Immersion School, 2016). These state-approved lessons “are taught from a Cherokee cultural perspective while addressing Oklahoma objectives” and require that attendees possess a federally recognized Certified Degree of Indian Blood (CDIB) (Immersion School, 2016). Similarly, the Spirit Mountain Community Fund grant and excess monies from a National Endowment for the Arts grant support the cultural

preservation of The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, including language preservation through three published children's books and a video craft series using traditional methods (Rhodes, 2014). Similar efforts to preserve language, arts, and other cultural factors are underway in tribes across the nation.

A history of traditions and culture provided by staff writers at the web resource Running Strong for American Indian Youth, perfectly summarizes the importance of preservation efforts (Traditions & Culture, 2014).

All tribes have a rich culture, whether founded in language or ceremony, which strengthen America as a nation today. Though Native cultures have struggled to survive tribes' ever changing relationship between self-determination and self-preservation, they remain vibrant and resilient as ever.

Self-determination, a concept identified as integral to tribal business operations in current literature, and self-preservation lead tribes toward increased autonomy and cultural revitalization. The function of these items is supported by both federally available grants and income from tribal businesses. The grants are largely supported by allocated funding from the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, but tribal business can take many forms.

Cultural Identification and Wine

The US Census Bureau (2012) predicts that the country's population will be "considerably...more racially and ethnically diverse by 2060." Commentators in the US wine industry have also noticed that the US consumer base is increasingly diverse. For example, Cole (2010) wrote about the "underserved, underrepresented, and untapped" African-American wine market, and how there is "without a shadow of a doubt a place for African-Americans in the fine wine industry." Cole goes on to express the sentiment that, beyond African-Americans, there is a larger minority market base that is not currently given the attention it deserves. Forman (2011)

gives a particularly powerful observation about the expansion in traditional consumer demographics:

America's wine culture is, of course, not immune to these tectonic shifts, and as increasing numbers of wine drinkers in previously non wine-focused communities—African-American, Hispanic, Asian and Millennials among many others—seek out the products and lifestyle associated, the industry is necessarily shifting the way it thinks about who its audience is.

Despite the observations from Cole and Forman, research into underserved wine markets is a relatively recent phenomenon, with both Hammond et al. (2014) and Velikova et al., (2016) choosing qualitative methods of exploring the experiences of African American and Hispanic consumers respectively. Hammond et al. (2014) found that wine “may be an inadvertent segregating beverage” with “wine knowledge...identified as a way to level the playing field in professional circles and serving as a means for acceptance in the business world” (p. 138). In the study's focus groups, wine was “perceived as a drink for Caucasians” (p. 139). This is a perception that the US wine industry can ill afford if the current year over year sales growth is to be maintained in the long run.

Velikova et al. (2016) reinforced this observation with findings that “the wine industry has largely ignored consumers who do not fit the profile of its traditional demographic base” (p. 60). However, minority wine consumers with higher levels of acculturation tend to be more interested in wine, and have the potential to serve as advocates for the less acculturated portion of the minority population (Velikova et al., 2016), which could allow for a demographic shift among wine consumers in the future.

Motivations

Motivations have been examined in non-Native wineries, i.e. the paper For Love or Money (Podolny, 2002), and found to be different in many scenarios based on owner and

company goals. For Native-owned wineries, it is possible that both passion and revenue could be motivating factors for the businesses due to the tribal reliance on diversified generation of revenue to fund tribal social structures and a connection to tribal lands.

Challenges

This category was identified as important because any business can expect to encounter challenges of one kind or another. Native-owned wineries are uniquely situated between two realities. There has been a modern move toward a booming United States wine industry as diversification from revenue generation based primarily on tribal gaming. Meanwhile, the realities of Native American tribal members' experience a generation ago – the incidence of poverty, disease, and cultural disintegration – are always consideration (Garrigues, 2012). The challenges of balancing between former member experiences and the newer diversification opportunities are very much on the minds of tribal members as they undertake wine-related ventures (Kettman, 2013).

Heritage

Native American tribes, spurred by gaming-generated wealth, are in a state of cultural revival, where emphasis is being placed on language and oral storytelling preservation, sustainability and connection with the land, and the observance of tribal holidays and celebrations (Garrigues, 2012, Cherokee Nation, 2017). This cultural revival inspired the final set of research questions, which seek to explore the relationship between tribal heritage and Native-owned wineries. Besides general issues of operation, an exploration of winery or product marketing as they relate to tribal heritage is another potential area for interesting relationships to develop.

American Viticultural Area

Tribally-owned Native American wineries operate on federally designated land. Because the location for operation is fixed by these designations, it is important to understand how that works with American Viticultural Areas, as the combination of these two factors will likely dictate some of the decisions made in winery operation and product type. When investigating wineries across the United States, it is necessary to note the area in which they operate, as this is important to success and feasibility. According to Stevenson (2011), the majority of wineries in America are found on the western coast because areas inland or those on the east coast are generally too humid or prone to extreme cold temperatures. The greatest production volume comes from California; however, Stevenson notes that almost every state in the country produces wine. The designation of American Viticultural Areas, or AVAs, began in the 1980's and is the method through which specific areas are recognized and registered with the federal government (Zrally, 2006). This system, modeled after the European regions, defines specific grape-growing areas within a state or region, such as Napa Valley in California or the Finger Lakes district in New York (Zrally, 2006). American Viticultural Areas are important to the study of American wine because they are accompanied by specific climates or physical characteristics which can dictate the grape varieties or wine styles that can be successfully produced (Zrally, 2006).

Wineries and Business Structure

Castaldi et al.(2005, p. 22) identified the emergence of four business models in recent years within the wine industry, which are classified as "Largest Player," "Lone Ranger," "Wine Groups," and "Diversified Conglomerate." The majority of wine companies are Lone Ranger wineries, which can be characterized as "1) a single location winery, 2) one that has no brick and

mortar structure but produces wine on a contract basis, or 3) wineries that own multiple properties but operate under a single set of labels”. The single Largest Player controls about 25% of the US market by volume (Castaldi et al, 2005), and grows by acquisition and offering a diversified product base. Wine Groups own a variety of wineries and labels under a single company, serving different segments of their customer base (Castaldi et al, 2005). Finally, Diversified Conglomerates have been lured into the wine industry by the high level of growth, and own ventures outside of it as well (Castaldi et al, 2005). When examining Native-owned wineries, it will be necessary to identify their business model and how that might relate to the role these wineries play in both tribal infrastructure and the general North American wine industry.

Tribal Business Diversification

Tribal researchers have identified the need to diversify business interests as a result of current realities in the gaming industry – i.e. slowed growth, market maturation, and increased competition (Meister, 2015; Freiss, 2015) – but that is a process that does not happen overnight. According to Fullmer (2013) if the trend continues, “it has been estimated that Indian gaming revenues could take a hit of up to 25 percent. This would be disastrous for many Tribal communities whose economies are built upon gaming revenue as their sole economic pillar.” Since tribes provide infrastructure improvements, educational opportunities, and social programs through the revenue produced by gaming, per the IGRA (Robertson, 2012), it is integral that funds continue to come in for these provisions. Fullmer (2013) recommends that, to successfully grow and diversify, leaders should “engage in critical deliberations about what kind of society they have now and what they’re hoping to have in the future.” These reflections can lead to the

prioritization of certain attributes over others when tribes begin to consider various avenues to diversification. A small amount of academic research has been conducted on this topic, with the attributes identified as important for future business opportunities by tribal members listed below (Reed, 2013).

- Brings increased revenue to tribe
- Creates jobs for tribal members
- Provides opportunities for community growth
- Increases potential customers for the casinos
- Provides opportunities for the preservation of tribal heritage
- Ties in with current tribal businesses

In moving toward the realization of these goals in new business endeavors, Reed (2013, pg. 132) describes the intentions of tribes to create a “business enterprise structure that encourages entrepreneurship and allows the tribe to take advantage of business opportunities without sacrificing cultural values.” The need to find balance between business enterprises and the cultural values of the population they support suggests that harmony from the point of the conceptualization of the enterprise through development and beyond should be a key consideration of tribal decision makers.

While cohesion between tribal values and tribal business is believed to be of great priority, it is also noted that, while “hospitality enterprises were financially crucial for the tribe...they were not culturally beneficial [or] culturally damaging” (Reed, 2013, pg. 132). The same study saw strong support of casino operations within the tribe and a belief that “hospitality enterprises, especially tribal gaming, are responsible for creating jobs and delivering the promise of a bright future for young tribal members” (Reed, 2013, pg. 132). This is important because it

points toward an acceptance of a controversial hospitality enterprise that has been determined by tribal members to provide more good than harm to the community in which it operates. While they have not yet become mainstream enough to say for sure, it is possible that the trajectory of tribal wineries will mirror that of tribally owned casinos. The present research is a foundational exploration of this topic in more detail from the points of view of two groups - tribes that are presently involved in the United States wine industry and those who are not.

Native Agriculture

According to the *Dictionary of American History* (2013), Native Americans began farming this continent “approximately 7,000 years ago, when Native people in the area of present-day Illinois raised squash.” Several theories suggest different reasons for initial crop harvests, including this description from the History of Illinois Agriculture exhibit at the Illinois State Museum:

Dr. David Asch has proposed that agriculture began with crops that were desirable but not vital. They were perhaps locally scarce or perishable, had multiple uses, or contained special substances (dyes, poisons, flavorings). These plants, if deliberately grown, supplemented the meat brought in by hunting and the plants collected by gathering. Groups moved around seasonally to regular settlements where they spend up to several months, long enough to sow and grow a crop (Illinois Agriculture Begins, 2016).

Over time, Native agricultural practices matured and became increasingly complex, with a basis in three major crops (corn, beans, and squash) supplemented by a variety of others (*Dictionary of American History*, 2013). These agricultural systems, primarily operated by the female membership (*Dictionary of American History*, 2013), contributed to tribes’ ability to provide additional resources in support tribal needs. In modern times, agriculture remains a fundamental part of many tribes’ cultural and economic identity.

According to the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI, 2017), agricultural

procedures and products have been integral to tribal economies and cultural preservation. The significance of the economic aspect of Native agriculture has increased in recent years, with the NCAI writing that:

Agriculture is increasingly important to Native economies, representing the economic backbone of more than 200 tribal communities and witnessing an 88 percent increase in the number of American Indian farmers between 2002 and 2007. According to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 annual Indian agriculture production exceeded \$1.4 billion in raw agriculture products (NCAI, 2017).

The NCAI advocates for government support of tribal agricultural practices to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), whose “programs would generate significant benefits for tribes, rural communities, and the nation by promoting economic development, job opportunities, and growth” (NCAI, 2017). Existing within the USDA is the Office of Tribal Relations, advised by the Council for Native American Farming and Ranching, which works to provide connections between tribal needs and the resources available through the USDA. USDA tribal resources include Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Farm Service Agency, Food Distribution Program to Indian Reservations, Forest Service, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Service, and Rural Development, as well as a host of archived webinars and other general resources (USDA, 2017). In particular, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is integral to tribal function, because it “partners with Native American communities on important projects through cooperative agreements, technical emergency training, outreach activities, and consultations that ensure Native cultural heritage and values are respected” (APHIS, 2012). As a result of Native advocacy efforts and support of government programs, economic development through agricultural practices has grown and expanded to support modern tribal membership needs.

Consumer Behavior

While this study does not directly examine Native Americans as a consumer group, it is important to provide a general background of the current demographic positions in wine-related research. The potential exists for Native American participants to respond in such a way as to reflect their demographic characteristics – such as age or gender – rather than simply their cultural values. It is important that these instances are identified and presented in the context of other current findings. Research regarding wine consumption patterns of individuals has been undertaken in an attempt to better understand the market needs and identify the unique drinking patterns, beliefs, behaviors, and lifestyle choices of certain market segments – whether by age, period, or cohort. Broader studies of the differences across all age, period, and cohort barriers have compared attitudes, personal histories, and perceptions of wine's image (Olsen et al, 2007) and attempted to estimate the separate influences of these factors on consumption (Kerr et al, 2004). Other studies have taken one specific cohort, such as Generation Y or Millennials, and examined their experiences for a richer look at the motivations, situational drivers for behavior, and particular values in order to develop successful marketing strategies (Agnoli, 2011; Thach & Olsen, 2006). The need to distinguish between the multifaceted characteristics of ages, periods, and cohorts on a broad scale is equally important as the need to tease out specific details of the motivations and behaviors of a single portion of the population. These pieces of information work together to give a more complete picture of researchers' current understandings of the influence of demographics on consumption behaviors and adjust marketing tactics accordingly.

The relationship between consumers and wine has been researched outside of age-related demographics as well. Studies have examined the relationship between wine expertise and purchasing/consumption behaviors (Johnson & Bastain, 2007) and sought to identify the forces

driving wine consumers (Hussain et al, 2007) as well as the benefits that consumers look for when purchasing wine (Orth et al, 2005). Extrinsic motivators such as packaging have been examined in relation to consumer groups (Lockshin et al, 2006), including the influence of packaging on decision making and the interplay of external cues with age, gender, and income level (Barber & Almanza, 2006). Specifically, regional packaging has been found to influence consumption (Bruwer & Johnson, 2010). Such lifestyle choices, as in region of residence, tend to be a more reliable source of new wine consumers than do traditional demographic measures such as age (Thach & Olsen, 2004).

Native American Consumers

Native American consumer spending has seen a sharp increase in recent years, with an annual expenditure of \$20 billion dollars in 1990 more than quadrupling to \$83 billion dollars spent in the year 2014 (Miller, 2015). Although these numbers are large in an absolute sense, the percentage of total Native American consumer spending was only 0.5% in 1990, with a slight increase to 0.6% by 2014 (Miller, 2015). A multicultural economy report from The Selig Center (2010) posits that this massive increase in Native American buying power is supported by rapid population growth and growth in the number of Native-owned businesses. The following table shows the top 10 states with the largest Native American buying power and the states with the largest Native American shares of total buying power as of 2014 (Miller, 2015).

Table 1

Native American Market and Buying Share

Largest Market Share of Native American Buying Power		Largest Native American Share of Total Buying Power	
California	\$9.4 billion	Alaska	8.6%
Oklahoma	\$6.5 billion	Oklahoma	5.3%
Texas	\$4.9 billion	New Mexico	4.5%
Arizona	\$3.9 billion	Montana	3.4%
New Mexico	\$2.6 billion	South Dakota	3.3%
Washington	\$2.5 billion	North Dakota	2.7%
Florida	\$2.5 billion	Arizona	2.0%
Alaska	\$2.4 billion	Wyoming	1.3%
North Carolina	\$2.3 billion	Nevada	1.0%
New York	\$2.3 billion	Washington	1.0%

In terms of Native American consumer geographic distribution by population number, Miller (2015) also provides population rates and the relative percentage for each state that the population comprises.

Table 2

Native American Population Centers (Miller, 2015)

	Percentage	Population Size
California	1.0%	362,801
Oklahoma	8.6%	321,687
Arizona	4.6%	296,529
New Mexico	9.4%	193,222
Texas	0.7%	170,972
North Carolina	1.3%	122,110
New York	0.6%	106,906
Alaska	14.8%	104,871
Washington	1.5%	103,869
South Dakota	8.8%	71,817

In terms of individual Native American consumers, Miller (2015) reports that the median household income for “single-race American Indian or Alaskan Native households was \$35,310. This compares with \$51,371 for all U.S. households.” This disparity is reflected in the poverty rates, as well, with 29.1% of single-race American Indians or Alaskan Natives classified as

impoverished as compared to 15.9% of the nation as a whole (Miller, 2015).

These trends suggest that, while Native American consumer spending has increased dramatically since 1990, the single race members of this population are still more likely to earn less than the national median household average and more likely to live in poverty. This reality may be mitigated if biracial individuals are included in the samples reported, and large instances of population growth and an increase in Native-owned businesses are reported by the Selig Center as possible boons to Native American consumer spending. Native American spending is largely concentrated in the states of California, Oklahoma, Texas, and Arizona, while Native American populations are most highly concentrated (by population number) in California, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas (Miller, 2015).

Marketing and Culture

Scholar and member of the Choctaw Nation Devon Mihesuah writes in his 2015 book *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities* on the widespread misrepresentation of Native American individuals in the United States that:

No other ethnic group in the United States has endured greater and more varied distortions of its cultural identity than American Indian. Distorted images of Indian culture are found in every possible medium – from scholarly publications and textbooks, movies, TV shows, literature, cartoons, commercials, comic books, and fanciful paintings, to the gamut of commercial logos, insignia and imagery that pervade local tourist locales throughout the Southwest and elsewhere (p. 13).

Not only are Native American cultural images often distorted and oversimplified, they are also appropriated for use as both sporting and brand mascots in mainstream culture. The offense of a “Redskin” sporting mascot is described by Cherokee author and activist Adrienne K. as “disparaging, stereotypical, and harmful to the psychological wellbeing of our youth. They honor a mythic past that erases our current existence” (Native Appropriations, 2016). The lack of depth

and true understanding in this type of imagery is deeply troubling to many such tribal members who do not wish to see their heritage, culture, and the foundation of their identities reduced to a caricature.

An example of Native American resistance to this imagery in brand marketing can be seen in the Crazy Horse Malt Liquor case, which saw both tribal and federal court proceeding to determine the rights of descendants in protecting the memory of Crazy Horse by limiting uses of his name that were deemed inappropriate or opposed to the values he famously espoused. The *South Dakota Law Review* detailed each set of the proceedings, as well as the ultimate outcome of removing this product from shelves and accepting a formal apology from the CEO of the company (Pommersheim, 2012). The intense public outcry documented in media and literature (see for example Novello, 1993 and “Native Americans speak with one voice against Crazy Horse,” 1992) came largely as a result of the perception that the size of the 40 ounce container was suited to binge drinking and targeted specifically at the Native American population where alcoholism was a pressing public health problem (Pommersheim, 2012). In this instance, an interest outside of the tribe misused a historic tribal figure in full ceremonial dress in a divisive and potentially damaging way. No literature currently exists documenting the use of tribal imagery in marketing Native-created or produced products, which is an additional gap that the current project addresses.

Wine Packaging/Labeling

In considering the complex relationship between Native American tribal entities and the United States wine industry, it is necessary to examine research related to wine packaging. The unique juxtaposition of tribal imagery, often exploited in the past by both alcohol-based and non-

alcohol-based marketing campaigns, with the need for existing tribally-owned wineries to promote and sell the products produced, begs examination from the point of view of both involved and non-involved tribal members. This relationship, as with several aforementioned others, has yet to be examined by academic researchers and presents an interesting gap in the currently available literature on wine packaging.

Research concerning wine labels and packaging is tied to consumers' intent to purchase products based on a variety of aesthetic and informative attributes. Two basic factors comprise the initial impression of the wine packaging, described by Rocchi and Stefani as a two-handed approach where "on the one hand consumers seem to be affected by shape, size, and colour of the bottle; on the other hand, they consider the dress of the bottle represented by the set of the other packaging elements (labels, capsules)" (2005, p. 43). These two aspects have been addressed in wine packaging research both together and independently, with a variety of attribute combinations examined. Multiple studies have confirmed the importance of the wine label in consumers' intent to purchase specific products and discussed how this information can best be applied at the beginning of the design process as a segment of a successful sales approach in the product category (Rocchi & Stefani, 2005; Barber & Almanza, 2006; Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007; Barber, Ismail & Taylor, 2007; Barber, Almanza & Dodd, 2008; Chrea, Melo, Evans, Forde, Delahunty & Cox, 2011; Atkin & Newton, 2012), with additional findings in relation to specific label attributes and consumer demographics.

Rocchi and Stefani (2005, p. 42) found that participants in their study "link distinction with the care spent to design the bottle, assessing the coherence in the use of characters, clear printing, homogeneous graphical signs on different parts of the bottle, and so on." These respondents expected a consistent standard of care to be applied across the design elements,

including cohesion between the front and back labels. Barber and Almanza (2006) found that the most important information contained on the front label is the country of origin and brand name, while the back label must be simple and include details on the style and flavor of the wine. Chrea et al. (2011) found importance primarily in the price and region of origination, with grape varietal, awards won, and vintage considered as secondary keys to interpretation. The results of a study by Atkin and Newton (2012) indicate that emphasizing the geopolitical region of production, such as Sonoma County, as opposed to the AVA or appellation designation on the label can lead to an increase in consumer intent to purchase – likely due to the perception of quality within the region resulting in a halo effect.

Aside from considerations of region and perceived quality, the majority of respondents found wine labels intimidating, “with females significantly more concerned than males about making the wrong wine selection” (Barber & Almanza, 2006). There should be an overall emphasis on the importance of keeping the information contained on the wine label simple and accessible to maximize consumer reach, with the consumers’ knowledge playing an important role in how they approach the front label information (Barber & Almanza, 2006, p. 96; Barber, Almanza & Dodd, 2008; Chrea et al., 2011). The following is a description of the importance of label simplicity at a lower price point:

Labels should have basic information on style of wine (sweet, semi-sweet, or dry), type of grape, location of winery and description of winery, particularly at the \$10 to \$14 price point where the customer still thinks of wine as fermented grape juice and may be uncertain about their wine choices (Barber, Ismail & Taylor, 2007, p. 83).

Simplicity is considered integral at all price points, however, as Chrea et al. (2011) found that price is often used as a surrogate consideration of quality when the consumer has a low level of knowledge in the purchase area, which functions as a risk reduction strategy.

In examining facets of brand personality, Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) found that the

facets of successful, charming, up to date, and spirited translated most into wine purchase intent, with facets of outdoorsy and tough the least related. Of additional interest to the present research agenda concerning the marketing of Native-owned winery products, Boudreaux and Palmer examined images on wine labels and how they related to purchase intent. The findings were that “image alone was responsible for an increase of 0.85 in purchase intent score (on the seven-point scale) from the least desirable images (the unusual animals) to the most-desirable images (grape motifs)” (Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007, p. 177). These findings indicate that while the present research concerning meaningful Native American imagery on wine labels is measured in terms of appropriateness, they should still be carefully considered in the context of effective wine marketing strategies. The challenge in creating packaging for wine products, then, is to balance the necessary information – i.e. a simple but informative description of key components – with the formation of an aesthetically pleasing design.

Barriers to Success

It is important to identify the potential barriers to successful winery operation that may be present before considering the viability of winery operation for tribal entities. The three primary challenges to successful winery operation identified by Holyoke and Heath-Simpson (2013) are the ability of the operator(s) to learn the winery business, the relationship the operator(s) develop with other area wineries, and finally the general business acumen of the operator(s). A large collection of recent research also examines authenticity in winery operations, with perceived authenticity being the most important in the current context and a potentially powerful barrier to successful winery operation (Kim & Bon, 2016; Robinson & Clifford, 2012). Finally, Reynaud and Simon (2006) laid out the importance of addressing core competences of know-how,

dexterity, actions, attitudes, comportment, and interaction to successful winery operation. The absence of consideration of the preceding factors will, at best, limit the potential success of tribally owned winery operations or, at worst, diminish precious tribal resources through inception and support of a failed business venture. It is integral that barriers to tribal winery operation be considered not only in terms of the experiences of mainstream operations, however, because the perceptions of tribal members will also be important as potential supporters or detractors of the venture.

Theoretical Framework

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory hypothesizes that the importance of group membership to individuals, i.e. the extent to which belonging to a certain in-group is “a real, true and vital part of the person,” will directly impact that individual’s thoughts and actions (McLeod, 2008). Social identity theory in the context of this research will be important in ensuring an appropriate representation of Native American individuals, because many members of the larger federally recognized tribes have fully assimilated into the dominant mainstream culture. It is important to note that an appreciable difference exists in the groups being studied. The variety and relative degrees of differences in worldviews of individuals has been identified as important factor in counseling and treatment programs, because efforts to positively impact patients depend significantly on the counselor’s ability to understand the foundational assumptions and respond appropriately. For this reason, the scale used in counseling to test for Native American acculturation has been adopted as an indicator of in-group belonging.

CHAPTER 3:

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The present research design emerged at the intersection of aspiration and practicality. When it was originally conceived in 2015 and presented for approval in the spring of 2016, the form was very different. While the content and overarching goal remain intact, the new study was designed after the realities of tribal IRBs made it necessary to design a phone- and internet-based study. The original goal to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative measures to ensure a comprehensive, high quality approach to this important and potentially sensitive subject matter was maintained in the new conceptualization. To this end, a modified mixed-methods exploratory sequential model was adopted to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation.

An extensive literature review was developed to guide academic inquiry, and a panel of experts provided valuable insight. Because this was truly exploratory research, the expert panel aided in the design where literature did not exist. While some portions of the design were able to draw from literature that was tangentially related, no research that combines the examination of winery operation and the Native American population has ever been conducted. Upon approval of the redesigned proposal, an instrument was developed with the expert panel and IRB approval from the University of Arkansas was received.

Population and Sampling Method

Phase 1: Quantitative

Individuals of Native American descent were the population sampled for this study. Participants from federally recognized tribes were invited to complete the survey distributed in *Phase 1* and encouraged to forward the online link to other qualified participants. This method, snowball sampling, was appropriate because it has been established as a “means of accessing vulnerable and more impenetrable social groupings” (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). Native American tribes, while highly varied, are described in the Culturally Responsive Curriculum for Secondary Schools as possessing the trait of mutualism (Northwest Indian Applied Research Institute, n.d.):

As a value, attitude, and behavior, mutualism permeates everything in the traditional Indian social fabric. Mutualism promotes a sense of belonging and solidarity with group members cooperating to gain group security and consensus.

This tendency toward mutualism provides opportunities to receive responses from a larger group of participants when a key contact person is reached. An online survey link through Qualtrics was distributed by email and social media, and respondents were encouraged to share the link with other qualified participants.

Phase 2: Qualitative

Research participants were selected from those who indicated willingness to participate in a follow-up interview during completion of the survey in *Phase 1*. The composition of the cohort chosen to participate in *Phase 2* was selected using purposeful sampling based on the demographic characteristics of *Phase 1* respondents, with the goal of obtaining a diverse group of interviewees.

Data Collection Techniques

A modified mixed-methods exploratory sequential research model of non-involved tribal members was used. Non-involved tribal members (shortened to non-involved) were those Native American individuals whose tribe does not currently participate in the United States wine industry. *Phase I* was a quantitative survey of non-involved members that was undertaken to identify their current perceptions of the strengths, challenges, and opportunities of Native-owned wineries in terms of business diversification, marketing with tribal icons and symbols, perceived barriers to success, and perceived benefits of tribal winery operation.

Next, a qualitative interview protocol was developed to examine the quantitative findings in greater detail. The results from *Phase I* were used to inform the development of an interview protocol and appropriate question probes to explore in more detail the thoughts and feelings of non-involved individuals. The protocol included examination of participants' perceptions of challenges and benefits associated with tribal winery operation, the perceived viability of such operations, and the appropriateness of each marketing category that appeared on the survey instrument.

Instrument

A survey instrument was developed to measure perceived barriers to tribal entry into the wine industry, perceived benefits of tribal entry into the wine industry, acceptability of Native American symbols and icons used in marketing tribal wine products, and the perceived viability of tribal winery operations.

Because this is foundational research of an unexamined area, a panel of experts aided in the development of the survey instrument. “Expert” is defined as having obtained an advanced degree in hospitality and/or having a background in Native American hospitality enterprises. The researcher compiled a list of potential barriers and benefits to tribal winery operation from previous literature. It was explained to the panel that some of the information could be transferable to tribally operated wineries, and that some barriers may exist which are not listed here because of the differences presented in a tribal setting. The panel was encouraged to critique the list and add/edit/delete from it based on their experiences in this specific business category. The following list of potential barriers mentioned in literature was provided to the panel for discussion:

Table 3

<i>Potential Barriers to Winery Success</i>	
Holyoke & Heath-Simpson (2013)	Learning the winery business
	Building a relationship with other wineries
	General business acumen
Kim & Bon (2016)	Perceived authenticity of the venture
Robinson & Clifford (2012)	
Reynaud & Simon (2006)	Core competences (know-how, dexterity, actions, attitudes, comportment, and interaction)

Next, the panel was presented with a list of potential benefits that a winery business could provide in a tribal setting, as supported in existing literature.

Table 4

<i>Potential Benefits of Business Diversification through Winery Operation</i>	
Reed (2013)	Brings increased revenue to tribe
	Creates jobs for tribal members
	Provides opportunities for community growth
	Increases potential customers for the casinos
	Provides opportunities for the preservation of tribal heritage
	Ties in with current tribal businesses

The panel then worked together, drawing from their professional and academic knowledge, to brainstorm other potential barriers and benefits of tribal winery operation, and offer suggestions for modifying the existing lists. Each of the identified barriers and benefits was rated by non-involved participants on a Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” that the barrier or benefit is likely to exist.

To measure the acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced winery products, the expert panel brainstormed categories where these symbols and icons could fall. Examples include geography, historic figures, ceremonial dress, and other areas that lend themselves to providing clarity to survey respondents. Non-involved participants were asked to rate the use of each category in marketing from “completely unacceptable” to “completely acceptable.”

Finally, survey respondents were asked two basic summary questions. Firstly, whether they believe tribal winery operation would be a viable opportunity for tribal enterprises in their

tribe and secondly, whether it would be a viable opportunity for other tribes. The response options for these questions were based on a Likert scale for consistency with the rest of the survey, with the expert panel advising on the appropriate anchors to be used.

Validity and Reliability

Content Validity

The consideration of validity “refers to the degree to which it measures what it is supposed to measure,” with the main types being “content validity, criterion validity, and construct validity” (Pallant, 2013, p. 7). For the instrument to be considered valid, it must measure true differences that exist between the participants and concepts presented in the current research (Churchill, 2001; Cobanoglu, 2001). For the purposes of this study, content validity was examined in order to test “a scale not against a single criterion but in terms of theoretically derived hypotheses concerning the nature of the underlying variable or construct” (Pallant, 2013, p. 7). This was established through thorough advisement, discussion, and modification of the instrument by the expert panel.

Reliability

The reliability of the instrument in this research concerns the extent to which the measurement will provide consistent results and is free of random error (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Pallant, 2013). Reliability refers to the capacity to achieve comparable results by measuring a construct with independent but equivalent measures (Churchill, 2001). The two most commonly used indicators of reliability are test-retest reliability and internal consistency (Pallant, 2013). While test-retest reliability requires administration of the instrument to the same group two different times, internal consistency (commonly measured using Cronbach’s alpha)

“provides an average correlation among all of the items that make up the scale. Values range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater reliability” (Pallant, 2013, p. 6). Nunnally (1978) recommends a Cronbach’s alpha of at least .7 for adequate internal consistency (as cited in Pallant, 2013). This instrument is considered reliable based on this information, with each portion of the questionnaire having a Cronbach’s alpha of .884 to .996.

Data Analysis

Phase 1: Quantitative

An internet –based Qualtrics survey was distributed via email and social media. Descriptive statistics were run from demographic data to establish information about the characteristics of the sample used in this study, including gender, age, level of education, and acculturation score.

Analysis of the hypotheses was conducted using the statistical software SPSS. Independent variables used were participants’ acculturation score and demographic characteristics. Dependent variables were scores of perceived barriers, perceived benefits, marketing acceptability, and perceived viability. To analyze the interactions between these variables, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA), *t*-tests, and correlations was conducted to examine the impact of the independent variables (demographic characteristics of age, gender, level of education, income, or acculturation score) on the dependent variables (perceived barriers, perceived benefits, marketing acceptability, and perceived viability) to determine if statistically significant differences existed.

First, data was downloaded from Qualtrics into Microsoft Excel and coded for use with the statistical software Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The final two columns of

data from Qualtrics included participants' names and phone numbers if they were willing to participate in follow up research. To preserve their anonymity, these columns were cut from the data coding document and pasted into a standalone document, along with the demographic information of age, gender, tribe, and whether they worked for a tribal organization. This information aided in the selection of a diverse group for the qualitative interviews conducted in *Phase 2*.

During the first portion of data analysis, frequencies and percentages were calculated as descriptors of the demographic characteristics of the survey sample. This information was useful in describing the sample, as well as addressing part of the quantitative research hypotheses. This information is presented in Chapter 4 as it applies to both the overall characterization of the sample and specifically to the research hypotheses.

Next, the hypotheses were addressed in order, using the appropriate data analysis techniques in SPSS. Hypothesis 1 and 2 were addressed with descriptive statistics and frequencies. The objective of these hypotheses was to describe the current perceptions of Native American individuals (non-involved) of barriers and benefits of entry into the wine industry and the level of acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced winery products.

Hypotheses 3, 4, 5, and 6 were addressed through *t*-test and ANOVA analysis, with correlations included as appropriate. For analysis, *t*-tests were appropriate in instances where the mean scores of a continuous variable in two groups (i.e. male and female) were compared (Pallant, 2013). Because the scores were not repeated measures, such as those that would compare outcomes of a pre- and post-test, independent sample *t*-tests were the specific type used. In instances where two or more groups were examined (i.e. the acculturation measure where

respondents could score as traditional, marginal, bicultural, assimilated, or pantraditional), analysis of variance (ANOVA) was appropriate in order to compare the mean ratings in their scores of a particular continuous variable (Pallant, 2013). As with the *t*-tests performed, there were not repeated measures used in this research project, so a one-way analysis of variance, in which the effect of a single independent variable on the dependent variable is measured, was appropriate. Where significant differences were found, post hoc comparisons were run to determine where the difference appeared. Finally, correlations were run to determine the “strength of the relationship between two continuous variables” (Pallant, 2013, p. 107). This test was included in an effort to build a thorough foundation for future research, because there is no existing data on the subject of Native American’s perceptions of tribal winery products and operation.

Phase 2: Qualitative

Sensitizing concepts, defined as “those background ideas that inform the overall research problem,” were used to structure qualitative data analysis (Charmez, 2003). These concepts were business diversification, perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry, the potential benefits of winery operation, the preservation of heritage through agriculture, issues of marketing, and the perceived future of tribal winery operation. Three phases of coding – open, axial, and selective – were used in the analysis of interview data (Creswell, 2007). In the first phase of coding, open coding, the researcher examined interview transcripts looking for relevant information with which to form categories. Through this process, constant comparative analysis was conducted in order to “saturate the categories – to look for instances that represent the category and to continue looking until the new information obtained does not further provide insight” (Creswell, 2007). Next, axial coding took place for each of the core categories identified in the open coding

phase. During axial coding, the researcher returned to the data and identified categories surrounding the core category. As cited in Creswell (2007), Strauss and Corbin (1990) prescribed causal conditions, strategies, contextual and intervening conditions, and consequences as the appropriate considerations for each category in axial coding. Finally, selective coding was used to examine the models of each category and how they may be interrelated (Creswell, 2007). The researcher then formed hypotheses about the nature of Native American wineries from non-involved perspectives and answered research questions based on the outcome of the selective coding process.

Delimitations, Assumptions, and Limitations

For this study, delimitations were set for research questions and population. While the researcher acknowledges the potentially vast nature of thoroughly exploring the relationship of Native Americans and the US Wine Industry, consideration in this project has been given to business diversification, Native American symbols and icons as used in packaging and marketing, perceived barriers to success, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage. Further, this relationship will be examined from Native American individuals' points of view.

In performing this research, it is assumed that participants were open, honest, and accurate in their responses. Representatives of all 566 federally recognized tribes were not available for participation, so it is assumed that the responses received provide knowledge that is valuable and transferable to other Native American populations. Finally, it is assumed that participants answer both the survey questionnaire and the interview protocol in a manner that is thorough and representative of their perspectives.

Potential limitations include the inability to gain full access to all federally recognized tribes in the United States and the degree to which knowledge gained is potentially transferable between tribal enterprises. The respondent profile of the quantitative portion is an additional limitation, as access to tribal individuals willing to both fill out the survey and participate in a follow-up qualitative interview is not fully representative of the diverse views of tribal members across the nation. Data collected through the online survey portion of this research may be skewed by virtue of the digital delivery method. A limitation in coding the qualitative data is the use of an assumptive framework, and finally, the researcher must take whatever data the participants are willing to offer during the interview process. The voices of representatives of

tribes who currently operate wineries are not heard in this project, as no participants agreed to participate in the in-depth interviews required to address their side of the story.

Research Questions

The designation of “non-involved” was created to provide clarity to the research questions. Non-involved individuals are members of federally recognized tribes who do not currently have a role in the wine industry.

1. What are non-involved tribal participants’ current perceptions of tribally owned winery operations?
2. What are the perceptions of non-involved Native American individuals toward the use of Native American icons or symbols on tribally owned winery products for marketing purposes?
3. How do non-involved Native American participants perceive the future of tribal winery operations?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perceptions of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perception of benefits of entry in non-involved participants.

Hypothesis 2:

Non-involved participants will rate acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced wine products on a Likert scale as a measure of less than neutral.

Hypothesis 3:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Women will rate overall perceived barriers as higher than men.
- B. Overall perceived barriers will be parallel to participants' age.
- C. Participants with lower education will have a higher perception of overall barriers.
- D. Higher income will be related to a lower overall perception of barriers.

Hypothesis 4:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived benefits to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Men will rate overall perceived benefits higher than women.

- B. Overall perceived benefits will be inversely related to participants' age.
- C. Participants with higher education will have a higher perception of overall benefits.
- D. Higher income will be related to a higher overall perception of benefits.

Hypothesis 5:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perceived viability of tribal winery operations.

Hypothesis 6:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation.

- A. Those with an acculturation score of "Bicultural," "Assimilated," or "Pantraditional" will have a lower perception of perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry.
- B. Those with an acculturation score of "Traditional" or "Marginal" will have a lower perception of perceived benefits of entry into the wine industry.

CHAPTER 4:

FINDINGS

Results and Discussion

Chapter 3 discussed the specific methodologies used in the execution of the present research. Data was analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods, using SPSS and open, axial, and selective coding respectively. This chapter presents and contextualizes the results of the analyses, using the hypotheses and research questions as parameters. Outcome of the statistical analyses of Phase 1 data is presented first, including demographic characteristics, frequencies, and the results of *t*-test, ANOVA, and correlation measures. The coding and analysis of data from Phase 2 and Phase 3 are presented together, with discussion of the related figures from Phase 1, by category according to the results of the qualitative analysis and guided by the research questions.

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation. Specifically, issues of business diversification, marketing, the role of agriculture, actual versus perceived barriers to success, and the preservation of tribal heritage were considered.

Phase 1 Response Rate

A link to the online Qualtrics survey for Phase 1 was distributed through email and social media (http://uark.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5nm1bT4mul3nTKJ), and respondents were encouraged to share the information with other potential participants. Recruitment was directed toward individuals of Native American blood or tribal descent, with a screening question at the beginning that routed non-Native responses directly to the final message of the survey that thanked them for their willingness to participate. At the end of the completed surveys, respondents were given the opportunity to provide their name and phone number if they were willing to participate in a follow up interview for Phase 3.

Table 5 shows the collected usable and unusable survey response rates. A total of 192 surveys were collected. Of these, 150 (78.1%) survey responses were at least 72% complete, which was considered the threshold for usable data. Another 42 (21.9%) survey responses were either less than 72% complete or answered “No” to the screening question about Native American blood or tribal descent. All of the usable surveys were downloaded from Qualtrics into Excel, coded, and uploaded to SPSS for data analysis.

Table 5

<i>Phase 1 Response Rate</i>		
	Number	Percentage
Usable	150	78.1%
Un-usable	42	21.9%
Total	192	100%

Phase 1 Respondent Profile

The demographic characteristics of respondents are described for each of the key areas identified on the survey instrument, including gender, age, income, marital status, state of residence, occupation, employer type, education level, overall acculturation score, and self-identified tribal affiliation. Table 6 shows the gender breakdown of the 150 responses. There were 32 (21.3%) respondents who identified their gender as male, and 118 (78.7%) respondents who identified their gender as female.

Table 6

<i>Gender</i>	Frequency	Percent
Male	32	21.3%
Female	118	78.7%
Total (N)	150	100%

Respondents' ages were identified by category, with the majority of participants (47 of 31.3%) being 35-49 years old. The next largest category was ages 26-34, with 44 respondents comprising 29.3% of the total sample. In the age group of 50+, there were 31 (20.7%) individuals, and in the age group 21-25 years old, there were 21 (14.0%) individuals. Finally, there were 7 participants in the 18-20 age group, which accounts for the smallest percentage of the sample at 4.7%.

Table 7

<i>Age</i>	Frequency	Percent
18-20	7	4.7%
21-25	21	14.0%
26-34	44	29.3%
35-49	47	31.3%
50+	31	20.7%
Total (N)	150	100%

As shown in Table 8, less than 1% difference existed in the respondent totals for the two most populated income levels. Thirty-four individuals reported an income of \$30,001 up to \$50,000 per year, or 22.7% of the total. Close behind at 22%, the income level of \$50,001 up to \$75,000 per year had 33 responses. Above that level, \$75,001 up to \$100,000 per year had 24 members (16.0%), and More than \$100,000 per year had 18 (12.0%) responses. At the other end of the spectrum, \$19,999 or less per year had 23 (15.3%) responses, and \$20,000 up to \$30,000 per year had 18 (12.0%) responses.

Table 8

<i>Income Level</i>	Frequency	Percent
\$19,999 or less	23	15.3%
\$20,000 up to \$30,000	18	12.0%
\$30,001 up to \$50,000	34	22.7%
\$50,001 up to \$75,000	33	22.0%
\$75,001 up to \$100,000	24	16.0%
More than \$100,000	18	12.0%
Total (N)	150	100%

The majority of respondents for this survey (99 or 66.0%) are currently married. Twenty-three individuals (15.3%) reported their marital status as single, never married. The category of cohabitating had 7 responses, which comprised 4.7% of the sample, and there were 19 (12.7%) who marked separated or divorced. Finally, 2 respondents (1.3%) were widowed.

Table 9

<i>Marital Status</i>	Frequency	Percent
Single, never married	23	15.3%
Married	99	66.0%
Cohabitating	7	4.7%
Separated or divorced	19	12.7%
Widowed	2	1.3%
Total (N)	150	100%

Table 10 lists respondents' state of residence, with Oklahoma having the largest representation at 108 (72.0%). This is followed in representation by Arkansas at 21 (14.0%) and California with 5 (3.3%). Responses of Texas, Florida, Kansas, Virginia, New York, South Dakota, Arizona, and the United States came in at less than 3% each.

Table 10

<i>Non-Involved Participants by State</i>		
	Number	Percentage
Oklahoma	108	72.0%
Arkansas	21	14.0%
California	5	3.3%
Texas	4	2.7%
Florida	3	2.0%
Kansas	2	1.3%
Virginia	2	1.3%
New York	2	1.3%
South Dakota	1	0.7%
Arizona	1	0.7%
United States	1	0.7%
Total	150	100%

Participants categorized their occupation according to the list provided, with the majority of respondents (35 or 23.3%) working a professional career. This was followed closely by participants working in education, with 27 (18.0%) individuals choosing that category. Nineteen (12.7%) participants responded that their career was not described in the list, 16 (10.7%) participants were in sales, 13 (8.7%) participants were in management, and 10 (6.7%) participants held clerical positions. The remaining categories of self-employment (9 or 6.0%), unemployed (7 or 4.7%), student (8 or 5.3%), and retired (6 or 4.0%) had fewer than 10 respondents in each one, as seen in Table 11.

Table 11

<i>Occupation</i>	Frequency	Percent
Professional	35	23.3%
Management	13	8.7%
Clerical	10	6.7%
Sales	16	10.7%
Education	27	18.0%
Self-Employment	9	6.0%
Unemployed	7	4.7%
Student	8	5.3%
Retired	6	4.0%
Other	19	12.7%
Total (N)	150	100%

The employer type was primarily private organizations, with 70 or 46.7% of responses coming from employment in this type of organization. As shown in Table 12, this was followed by employment with the state government (30 or 20.0%), other (24 or 16.0%), tribal organizations (22 or 14.7%), and the federal government (4 or 2.7%).

Table 12

<i>Employer Type</i>	Frequency	Percent
Tribal Organization	22	14.7%
Federal Government	4	2.7%
State Government	30	20.0%
Private Organization	70	46.7%
Other	24	16.0%
Total (N)	150	100%

Most individuals participating in this research had some college (35 or 23.3%) or a bachelor's degree (47 or 31.3%). Participants at lower levels included 18 (12.0%) with an associate/vocational degree, 26 (17.3%) with a high school diploma or GED, and 4 (2.7%) with less than a high school education. Respondents with advanced degrees included 15 (10.0%) with

a master's degree, 2 (1.3%) with a doctoral degree, and 3 (2.0%) with a professional degree such as a juris doctorate or medical degree.

Table 13

<i>Educational Level</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
Less than High School	4	2.7%
High School Graduate/GED	26	17.3%
Associate/Vocational Degree	18	12.0%
Some College	35	23.3%
Bachelor's Degree	47	31.3%
Master's Degree	15	10.0%
Doctoral Degree	2	1.3%
Professional Degree (JD, MD)	3	2.0%
Total (N)	150	100%

Of particular interest in the current research were participant's acculturation scores. These were formed from a questionnaire that averaged a score from 20 multiple choice responses as designed and validated by Garrett & Pichette (2000). As Table 14 shows, none of the individuals who participated identified as traditional on the acculturation scale. Four (2.7%) respondents identified as marginal, and one respondent (0.7%) identified as pantraditional. The greatest number of respondents identified as bicultural (57 or 38.0%) and assimilated (88 or 58.7%).

Table 14

<i>Overall Acculturation Score</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
Traditional	0	0.0%
Marginal	4	2.7%
Bicultural	57	38.0%
Assimilated	88	58.7%
Pantraditional	1	0.7%
Total (N)	150	100%

The final portion of demographic information collected was the tribe to which each participant claimed membership. The biggest representation in this study is that of the Cherokee Nation, with 120 individuals making up 80% of the responses received. This is followed by those who identify as Choctaw (7 or 4.7%), Muscogee Creek (6 or 4.0%), Mohawk (2 or 1.3%), and the United Keetowah Band (2 or 1.3%). One member (0.7%) each of the following tribes also participated: Apache, Caddo, Canadian Band of Ojibiwe, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Hupa, Miwok, Northern Sierra Miwok, Sherwood Valley Rancheria Pomo Indians of California, and Tsugwe. A portion of respondents also listed multiple tribes. One individual (0.7%) listed Arapaho, Cheyenne, and Kiowa, and another individual (0.7%) listed Cherokee and Chickasaw. Two respondents listed Cherokee and Choctaw (1.3%), and one respondent listed Cherokee and Creek (0.7%).

Table 15

<i>Non-Involved Participants by Tribe</i>		
	Number	Percentage
Cherokee	119	79.3%
Choctaw	7	4.6%
Creek (Muscogee)	6	4.0%
Mohawk	2	1.3%
United Keetowah Band	2	1.3%
Apache	1	0.7%
Caddo	1	0.7%
Canadian Band of Ojibiwe	1	0.7%
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	1	0.7%
Hupa	1	0.7%
Miwok	1	0.7%
Northern Sierra Miwok	1	0.7%
Sherwood Valley Rancheria Pomo Indians of California	1	0.7%
Tsugwe	1	0.7%
<i>Multiple Tribes Listed</i>		
Arapaho, Cheyenne, Kiowa	1	0.7%
Cherokee, Chickasaw	1	0.7%
Cherokee, Choctaw	2	1.3%
Cherokee, Creek	1	0.7%
Total (N)	150	100%

Phase 2 Respondent Profile

In the final portion of the quantitative survey, respondents were invited to share their contact information if they were willing to participate in a follow up survey. Of those who indicated interest in the follow up phone interviews, purposeful sampling was used to identify 10 potential interviewees. Four male participants were chosen based on their states of residence (Arkansas, New York, and Oklahoma) and tribal affiliations (Creek, Mohawk, and Cherokee). Six female participants were chosen using the same criteria. States represented by the female respondents were Oklahoma, California, Florida, and New York. Tribal affiliations were Cherokee, Sherwood Valley Rancheria Pomo Indians of California, Miwok, and Mohawk. Due to the relatively large response rate of Cherokee individuals, members of this tribe represent half of interviewees. The other five respondents chosen for interviews represent a range of geographic locations and tribal affiliations. Respondents each gave permission to share the information in Table 16 to aid in contextualization of the interview data.

Table 16

Non-Involved Qualitative Participants

	Gender	Age	State	Tribe
Respondent #1	Female	32	Oklahoma	Cherokee
Respondent #2	Male	36	Arkansas	Creek
Respondent #3	Female	21	California	Sherwood Valley Rancheria Pomo Indians of California
Respondent #4	Male	36	New York	Mohawk
Respondent #5	Female	31	Florida	Cherokee
Respondent #6	Female	44	Oklahoma	Cherokee
Respondent #7	Male	39	Oklahoma	Cherokee
Respondent #8	Female	43	California	Miwok
Respondent #9	Female	31	New York	Mohawk
Respondent #10	Male	46	Oklahoma	Cherokee

At the beginning of each interview, respondents were asked whether they had any knowledge of or experience with tribally operated wineries. Of the ten respondents, only one had previous

experience in this enterprise area. Next, respondents were asked to characterize their opinion of tribally owned wineries as positive, neutral, or negative. Four respondents (40%) had a positive initial opinion of tribally operated wineries. Five respondents (50%) were neutral on the subject, and one respondent (10%) had a negative opinion of the concept.

Table 17

Qualitative Participants' Familiarity with and Opinion of Tribally Operated Wineries

	Familiar	Opinion
Respondent #1	No	Neutral
Respondent #2	No	Neutral
Respondent #3	No	Positive
Respondent #4	No	Positive
Respondent #5	No	Positive
Respondent #6	No	Positive
Respondent #7	No	Neutral
Respondent #8	Yes	Neutral
Respondent #9	No	Negative
Respondent #10	No	Neutral

Tables 16 and 17 serve as reference points to aid in understanding and contextualizing data from the qualitative analysis.

Research Questions

In *Phase 1*, a quantitative survey was distributed online and 150 completed surveys were received from non-involved Native American participants. At the end of the survey, participants had the option to volunteer for participation in *Phase 2*. In *Phase 2*, phone interviews were conducted over a two-week period at the interviewee's convenience. After each interview, the researcher created research memos concerning concepts that appeared important to each interviewee and emerging themes; each interview was transcribed by the researcher within 24 hours of its completion.

Initially, the qualitative interview data was coded, based on the design of the quantitative survey, into the categories of business diversification, perceived benefits of tribal winery operation, perceived barriers to success of tribal winery operation, preservation of tribal heritage, the role of agriculture, and marketing. Data from the categories of business diversification, perceived benefits, perceived barriers, preservation of heritage, and the role of agriculture was used to address both Research Question 1 and Research Question 3. Data in the category of marketing was designated to address Research Question 2.

Research Question 1

RQ1. What are non-involved tribal participants' current perceptions of tribally owned winery operations?

Research Question 1 is addressed by statistical analysis of Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, and 6, and qualitative exploration of the categories Business Diversification, Perceived Benefits of Tribal Winery Operation, Perceived Barriers of Tribal Winery Operation, and The Role of Agriculture and Preservation of Heritage.

Hypothesis 1.

There will exist an inverse relationship between perceptions of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perception of benefits of entry in non-involved participants

To test Hypothesis 1, an average benefit score and an average barrier score were first calculated for each respondent by averaging responses from the corresponding survey sections. Table 18 displays this information below. The perception of the benefits to tribal winery operation overall were perceived as being higher than the perception of barriers to entry into the industry. The difference in the means, however, was .58 which puts these two means within one standard deviation of each other.

Table 18

<i>Average Benefit Score and Average Barrier Score</i>			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Average Benefit Score	3.4489	.88814	135
Average Barrier Score	2.8737	.77868	141

In the next portion of the analysis, data was examined to see if an inverse relationship existed between perceived barriers and perceived benefits to winery operation for the demographic groups of age, gender, education level, and income level. To facilitate data analysis, correlations between demographic data were analyzed. For the categories of gender, age, and education, a significant relationship between the variables did not exist. For the category of income, Table 19 shows a relationship was present between income and the average barrier score. Cohen (1988) defines small correlations as those ranging from $r=.10$ to $.29$, medium correlations as $r=.30$ to $.49$, and large correlations as $.50$ to 1.0 . There exists a small negative correlation between the two variables of income and average perceived barrier score, $r = -.262$, $n = 141$, $p = 0.01$, with those having a greater amount of annual income having a lower perception that barriers were likely exist to tribal winery operation.

Table 19

<i>Correlations</i>						
	Age	Barrier	Benefit	Education	Gender	Income
Age	1					
Barrier	-.115	1				
Benefit	-.033	-.192	1			
Education	.047	-.150	-.062	1		
Gender	.041	.143	-.009	.074	1	
Income	.219**	-.262**	.006	.586**	.085	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In investigating Hypothesis 1, the data did not support a conclusion that an inverse relationship exists between the perception of barriers to tribal entry into the wine industry and the perception of the benefits that tribal winery operation could provide. A medium strength correlation was found between age and education, and two small strength correlations were found between the categories of age and income, and income and barrier. These findings could be due to the small sample size, and call for further investigation into this area.

Hypothesis 3

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Women will rate overall perceived barriers as higher than men.
- B. Overall perceived barriers will be parallel to participants' age.
- C. Participants with lower education will have a higher perception of overall barriers.
- D. Higher income will be related to a lower overall perception of barriers.

A *t*-test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationships between each of the variables in the sub-hypotheses and the average perceived barrier scores. The independent variables used were gender, age, education, and income. The dependent variable was the average perception of barriers score.

For Hypothesis 3A an independent sample *t*-test was conducted to examine the differences between the average perceived barrier score for female respondents ($M = 2.67$, $SD = .87$) and the average perceived barrier score for male respondents ($M = 2.93$, $SD = .74$). There was no statistically significant difference $t = -1.705$, $p = .090$.

Table 20

<i>Barrier Score by Gender</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Intervals	
Male	32	2.67	.87	Lower	Upper
Female	109	2.93	.74	-.57256	.04236

For Hypothesis 3B, the independent sample *t*-test was not significant. The average barrier score did not change significantly with respondents' ages. For this variable, the original categories seen in Table 21. Due to vast variability in ages reported, this variable was recoded to create a dichotomous variable containing Younger People (age 18-34) and Older People (age 35-50+). The new category of younger people includes respondents ages 18-34, and the new category of older people includes respondents ages 35+. The differences in average perceived barrier score for Younger People ($M = 2.92$, $SD = .82$) and the average perceived barrier score for Older People ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .74$) was not statistically significant $t = .661$, $p = .510$. While not significant, the average perception of barriers was actually lower in the older group.

Table 21

<i>Barrier Score by Age</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval	
Younger People	68	2.92	.82	Lower	Upper
Older People	73	2.83	.74	-.17310	.34690

For Hypothesis 3C, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' education level and average perceived barrier score. The independent variable of education was assessed utilizing the collapsed variables High school or less ($M = 3.03$, $SD = .76$), More than high school but less than Bachelor's ($M = 2.90$, $SD = .78$), Bachelor's degree ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .76$), and Master's degree or greater ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .87$). The dependent variable was the average perceived barrier score. The ANOVA was not significant $F(3, 137) = .693$, $p = .558$. The 95% confidence intervals are reported below in Table 22. Indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between education level and perceived barrier scores.

Table 22

Barrier Score by Education

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
High school or less	29	3.03	.76	2.745	3.318
More than HS, Less than Bachelors	48	2.90	.78	2.673	3.119
Bachelor's Degree	46	2.80	.76	2.570	3.026
Master's Degree or more	18	2.75	.87	2.390	3.118

For Hypothesis 3D, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluation the relationship between participants' income level and average perceived barrier score. The independent variable of income was assessed at 6 levels, as described in Table 23. The dependent variable was the averaged perceived barrier score. The ANOVA was significant $F(5, 135) = 2.74, p = .022$. The strength of the relationship between participants' income level and perceived barrier scores, as assessed by eta squared, was small, with income accounting for 9.2% of the variance in the dependent variable. Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate differences among the means. Because Levine's test was not significant, $F(3, 135) = 1.64, p = .153$, variances are assumed to be homogenous and post hoc comparisons were conducted using Tukey-Kramer due to the unequal sample sizes. They were significant between income level of \$19,999 or less and \$50,001 - \$75,000 ($p = .049$), however there were no significant differences between any other combination of income levels. The 95% confidence interval for pairwise differences as well as the means and standard deviations are reported in Table 23. The 95% confidence level was .0012 to 1.2035 for pairwise differences \$19,999 or less to \$50,001 - \$75,000.

Table 23

Barrier Score by Income

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	95% Confidence Interval				
				\$19,999 or less	\$20,000 - \$30,000	\$30,001 - \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$75,000	\$75,001 - \$100,000
\$19,999 or less	23	3.30	.63					
\$20,000 - \$30,000	17	3.14	.58	[-.320, .636]				
\$30,001 - \$50,000	30	2.77	.84	[.109, .938]*	[-.088, .819]			
\$50,001 - \$75,000	31	2.70	.85	[.191, 1.014]*	[-.006, .896]	[-.304, .462]		
\$75,001 - \$100,000	23	2.81	.76	[.047, .928]*	[-.148, .808]	[-.450, .378]	[-.526, .297]	
More than \$100,000	17	2.62	.72	[.200, 1.156]*	[.007, 1.033]*	[-.299, .608]	[-.376, .526]	[-.288, .668]

Note: An asterisk indicated that the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero and therefore the difference in means is significant at the .05 level using Tukey-Kramer procedure. *N*=Sample Size; *M*=Mean, *SD*=Standard Deviation.

Hypothesis 4

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived benefits to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

- A. Men will rate overall perceived benefits higher than women.
- B. Overall perceived benefits will be inversely related to participants' age.
- C. Participants with higher education will have a higher perception of overall benefits.
- D. Higher income will be related to a higher overall perception of benefits.

A *t*-test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationships between each of the variables in the sub-hypotheses and the average perceived benefit scores. The independent variables used were gender, age, education, and income. The dependent variable was the average perception of benefits score.

For Hypothesis 4A, an independent sample *t*-test examined the differences between the average perceived benefit score for female respondents ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .91$) and the average perceived benefit score for male respondents ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .81$). The analysis indicated there were no statistically significant differences $t = .101$, $p = .092$.

Table 24

<i>Benefit Score by Gender</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Intervals	
Male	30	3.46	.81	Lower	Upper
Female	105	3.44	.91	-.34645	.38359

For Hypothesis 4B, the independent sample *t*-test was not significant. The average benefit score did not decrease significantly with respondents' ages. For this variable, the original categories are seen in Table 7. Due to vast variability in ages reported, this variable was recoded to create a dichotomous variable containing Younger People (age 18-34) and Older People (age 35-50+). The difference between average perceived benefit score for Younger People ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .89$) and the average perceived benefit score for Older People ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .89$) was not statistically significant $t = .575$, $p = .566$. While not significant, the average perception of benefits was lower in the older group.

Table 25

<i>Benefit Score by Age</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval	
Younger People	64	3.50	.89	Lower	Upper
Older People	71	3.41	.89	-.21528	.39182

For hypothesis 4C, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the relationship between participants' education level and average perceived benefit score. The independent variable of education was assessed utilizing the collapsed variables High school or less ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .64$), More than high school but less than Bachelor's ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .84$), Bachelor's degree ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .96$), and Master's degree or more ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.18$). The dependent variable was the average perceived benefit score. The ANOVA was not significant $F(3, 131) = .495$, $p = .686$. Indicating that education levels did not impact average perceived benefit scores. The 95% confidence intervals are reported below in Table 26.

Table 26

Benefit Score by Education

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
High school or less	29	3.46	.64	3.127	3.783
More than HS, Less than Bachelors	45	3.50	.84	3.237	3.763
Bachelor's Degree	44	3.49	.96	3.220	3.753
Master's Degree or more	17	3.21	1.18	2.777	3.634

For Hypothesis 4D, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the relationship between participants' income level and average perceived benefit score. The independent variable of income was assessed at 6 levels, as described in Table 8. The dependent variable was the averaged perceived benefit score. The ANOVA was not significant $F(5, 129) = .594, p = .705$. The 95% confidence levels are reported in the table below.

Table 27

Benefit Score by Income

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
\$19,999 or less	23	3.30	.63	2.948	3.687
\$20,000 - \$30,000	17	3.14	.58	3.312	4.171
\$30,001 - \$50,000	30	2.77	.84	3.123	3.781
\$50,001 - \$75,000	31	2.70	.85	3.003	3.650
\$75,001 - \$100,000	23	2.81	.76	3.109	3.901
More than \$100,000	17	2.62	.72	3.039	3.924

Hypothesis 6

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation.

- A. Those with an acculturation score of “Bicultural,” “Assimilated,” or “Pantraditional” will have a lower perception of perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry.
- B. Those with an acculturation score of “Traditional” or “Marginal” will have a lower perception of perceived benefits of entry into the wine industry.

In addressing Hypothesis 6, samples sizes for Pantraditional ($n=1$), Traditional ($n=0$), and Marginal ($n=4$) were so small that conducting inferential statistical analyses was not reasonable. Unfortunately, the lack of respondents in these categories means that analysis of Hypothesis 6A is limited to consideration of Bicultural and Assimilated individuals, and analysis of Hypothesis 6B is not possible. To provide information addressed in the body of the main hypothesis (“participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation”), statistical analyses of the differences in barrier and benefit scores for Bicultural and Assimilated participants was conducted instead. The revised Hypothesis 6 reads:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation.

- A. A statistically significant difference will exist in the perceived barrier scores of respondents with an acculturation score of “Bicultural” and those with an

acculturation score of “Assimilated.”

- B. A statistically significant difference will exist in the perceived benefit scores of respondents with an acculturation score of “Bicultural” and those with an acculturation score of “Assimilated.”

For Revised Hypothesis 6A, an independent sample *t*-test examined the differences between the average perceived barrier score for Bicultural individuals ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .61$) and the average barrier score for Assimilated individuals ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .84$). Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances was significant $F(134.09) = 8.961$, ($p = .003$), indicating unequal variances. As a result, a Welch *t*-test was used, because this measure is robust against unequal variances and sample sizes. The analysis indicated that a statistically significant difference exists $t(134.09) = 2.033$, $p = .044$. The results indicate that Bicultural respondents perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry as significantly higher than Assimilated respondents.

Table 28

<i>Barrier Score by Acculturation</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Intervals	
Bicultural	55	3.04	.61	Lower	Upper
Assimilated	82	2.79	.84	.00682	.49758

For Revised Hypothesis 6B, an independent sample *t*-test examined the differences between average perceived benefit score for Bicultural respondents ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .96$) and the average perceived benefit score for Assimilated respondents ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .85$). The analysis indicated there were no statistically significant differences $t(130) = -.276$, $p = .194$. The results

indicate that Bicultural and Assimilated individuals did not differ significantly in their perception of the benefits of tribal winery operation.

Table 29

<i>Benefit Score by Acculturation</i>					
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Intervals	
Bicultural	54	3.42	.93	Lower	Upper
Assimilated	78	3.46	.85	-.35730	.26983

Research Question 1: Qualitative Analysis

Business diversification. For the category of business diversification, the following themes emerged: supporting other existing tribal businesses, applying existing tribal resources, land issues, matters of state and the US wine market, being new/novel, ties to heritage, and the potentially divisive nature of alcohol-based businesses.

Supporting other existing tribal businesses. Of the ten interviewees, 50% of respondents (respondents 1, 6, 7, 9, and 10), discussed the possibility of a tribally operated winery supporting existing tribal businesses. Respondent 6 spoke of the current period of growing enterprises in her tribe as a positive and exciting time:

There are the casinos it would directly support. Cherokee Nation is growing, and they're building onto their casinos all the time. They're adding hotels, they're adding so much to it that I think it could only get better and better.

Her view was that a tribally produced wine product would enhance tribal enterprises by allowing a "closed system," wherein bringing in an outside supplier was not necessary and the tribe would thereby save on costs:

They have some fantastic existing resources they could use. The casinos could sell the wine; they could use it in their restaurants. I mean, there are so many aspects. Even their

banquets that they do – they could utilize it there instead of having to pay some other company for their wine. Why pay someone else when you could be growing it and pay yourself? It's win/win.

Her positive view of her tribe's growth and the inclusion of a tribal wine product in existing operations led her to consider the opportunities that could exist as a way to bolster already thriving tribal operations.

The four remaining respondents (1, 7, 9, and 10) discussed use of a tribally produced wine being integrated into other existing tribal enterprises as a method of mitigating the potential negative association that they predict with alcohol produced by a sensitive population (i.e., their perception of their tribal population's struggle with alcohol being worsened by producing wine as a tribally affiliated business). Respondent 10's overall opinion of tribally owned wineries was neutral, and he described the concerns for alcoholism in the tribal population being balanced by potential funding for the tribe by saying, "I can also see it being a good thing if maybe they used their own products in their casinos and used it to support their tribe members." Though he was willing to acknowledge the potential benefit to the tribe, he remained hesitant to accept the concept if it would be damaging to tribal members.

Respondent 1, when considering her initial opinion on the subject of tribally owned wineries, described being of two minds about the appropriateness as a business venture in saying:

Well, initially just the uh, a tribe having a winery is a no, you know, a negative thought because they want a healthy tribe. But then you think about all the other operations that they have to bring in funding for all their different operations, the casinos serve alcohol. So it's kinda, that's why it's neutral.

Like Respondent 10, her initial perception was negative, but tempered to neutrality with the mitigating consideration of existing tribal business operations that make purchases from outside suppliers in the wine product category. Similarly, Respondent 9 felt that tribal businesses were

the only appropriate location to market a tribally produced wine product. Her concern for at-risk populations on her own reservation led her to consider that patrons of the other tribal hospitality enterprises – casinos and restaurants – were making a conscious choice to put themselves in a potentially compromising situation. Her thought process was:

I would say, they should totally hit up our casino. Just because they're not trying to market to our tribe personally, but there's casinos to go to our casino, but it's at your own risk to go there - your choice. There's that option where you might be addicted to gambling or drinking...I would say if you're trying to market, you should market to the businesses that do sell alcohol, because it's your choice to go there and drink. So I would say the many restaurants that's in our casino, then the fact that they serve alcohol to the people that's gambling, you could offer them wine. It wouldn't be in a glass though. If anything it would be more of the fine dining area where you sit there and have dinner and have a glass of wine.

Respondent 9's contention that the products could be used to support the tribe by replacing similar products in existing operations reduced her negative feeling toward presenting alcohol to the tribal population at large.

As described by the preceding 3 respondents, tribal winery products are not highlighted as high-quality or desirable, but rather used as cost-effective exchanges in areas that already deal in alcoholic beverages. Conversely, Respondent 7 described tribal production of alcohol as a means to support existing tribal businesses and supplant local competition for wine sales:

We're already selling this product in our casinos, these products in our stores, so when you go to the store and you're buying wine, you're buying wine from Arkansas, you're buying wine from other vineyards in Oklahoma, so why not make that another revenue for the Cherokee Nation.

His belief was that, while there are problems with alcohol in the tribal population, the reality of the situation is that the product is already pervasive in his area and used in tribal hospitality enterprises. Because the potential for negative interactions between tribal members and alcohol already exists, his perception was that it would be more beneficial to capture the revenue stream.

Applying tribal resources. Respondents 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, or 70% of interviewees, discussed applying tribal resources – business sense, networking abilities, financial and other assets, and reputation - to the wine industry. On the subject of business sense, Respondent 6 said, “Well I’ve seen enough that whenever a tribe gets involved in a business, they usually can make a very successful go of it. Their smoke shops for example, their casinos, they come out positive.” Similarly, Respondent 2 felt that tribal winery operation would be like any other winery operation, with the exception of “whatever monetary or networking advantages the tribe could bring to bear.” In this way, the strength of the concept is tied to the strength of the tribe. He elaborated on that summation by saying:

Just like any business that the tribe might engage in, if they can find a way to be good at it, I don’t know if they can apply any sort of tribal tax breaks to it or not, there might be business or tribal or some sort of other advantages they have, but aside from the possibility of those, you’ve got a group of people who already have contacts to each other, and so off you go with a business. I would think it would be the same as if they were starting a stationery or a tech company. You know, as a tribe you have some networking built in there.

Respondent 2 perceived that it would be easier to enter the industry by virtue of the connections and networking abilities that tribal entities possess, and this feeling is echoed by Respondent 5 in her contention that “it would be helpful if you could potentially discuss successful operations with tribes who have been able to implement them, and with the data.” Respondent 4 likewise believed in the value of cultivating connections with tribes who have successful winery operations

There’s plenty of examples around here of other people starting wineries not affiliated with the tribe...If this comes through [successful tribal winery operation as a result of the present research] and it all goes well and people see the value and start going at it down there, boy it would be awful nice if they would forward that data up here. They’re going to get you to build a model and go off of it, and it would be nice if we could too.

Though this research is not affiliated with a specific tribe or any current business agenda, it was his perception that connecting with the researcher as an opening to tribal relations could potentially provide a resource for his tribe. A validation of this perception came from Respondent 8, whose tribe is currently conducting research and considering winery operation. Respondent 8 reports that they've "gone to other tribes who have gone down this road, and we've been talking with them and looking at what they have done and just asking a lot of questions." The instinct of the respondents that it would be valuable to develop a mentoring relationship with a tribe who is already involved in winery operation is supported by the findings of Holyoke and Heath-Simpson (2013), which hold that a mentorship with a successful operation is one of the top keys to success. In-group belonging in Native American culture creates valuable social capital usable as tribes seek to build these mentoring relationships.

The concept of membership size was a differentiating factor between tribes' perception of how functional winery operation would be in their tribe. Respondent 4 felt that a tribally operated winery could work well for his tribe, because:

Some of the members we have, in the further north part of this state, you know we don't have the population to support the big casinos like they do down further south. I think this would be something that would probably go well for them. Our tribe kind of goes across Canada and New York, and along the St. Lawrence river.

This tribe's lack of geographic concentration limits the types of enterprises that can be staffed by tribal members, so he considered a winery to be a great non-traditional enterprise in which his tribe could engage. Respondents from the Cherokee tribe each noted that membership size would be an asset in considering a tribal winery operation.

Financial and physical assets were of primary importance in considering how existing resources could support a tribal winery operation. Respondent 6 described a recent tribal project

in which collections of stories from important tribal members were gathered and published through use of their tribal resources. She said:

They didn't use any university or government printing press. They did it all themselves so they could control exactly the way they want it done and not have to bend to the editors and censors and everything, and I just think it's so much more positive because they're able to kind of do things the way they want to do it. I mean of course there's still some regulations. But you're able to control everything from the beginning to the end.

In describing the self-regulation of the project, Respondent 6 speaks to tribal self-determination, an important concept for tribal entities as they seek to control their population's resources, provide for their membership, and preserve important pieces of tribal history.

Although most members considered existing tribal resources as assets to use in conceptualizing a winery, Respondent 7 described his view that if another business venture was viable for their tribe, he "would like to hope that there's somebody smart enough they'd have already figured that out." His assertion that any good business idea had likely already been considered spoke to his feeling of confidence in tribal leadership, which is arguably an asset itself. Respondents either noted that their tribe already has access to capital and land, or in the case of Respondent 8's tribe who is actively pursuing this avenue, "[tribal members] have been looking at the right piece of land, and um, seed money" to get started. Like membership size, this was another theme that arose during analysis that was divided by the size and existing assets of individual tribes.

Land issues. Eight respondents, or 80% of interviewees, discussed issues of land, including the availability, the location, and the surrounding population. As previously mentioned, Respondent 8's tribe was currently looking for the right piece of land for a winery operation. She described living in California and seeing "wineries going in everywhere" right now, and discussed the tribe's access to nonphysical resources such as the location's reputation

and other business owners. Members of her tribe are immersed in a wine-supported area that she describes as:

Just for us, ourselves, we're so close to places like Napa and all along the Sonoma Hills that there's plenty of mentoring and plenty of examples and people who are willing to help, and I honestly can't think of one single family member that doesn't know somebody that's affiliated with a farm or a winery in some kind of roundabout way.

Association with existing wine region is seen as an important consideration in pursuing the winery business for her tribe. Respondent 3 also lives in the Napa Valley area and noted that it was an area that is "big for the winery industry, there seems to be a lot of presence." Respondent 4 lives on the opposite coast but had a similar perception of a potential tribal winery in his region:

I think it's potentially an untapped market, particularly in the part of the country I live in where the Finger Lake regions are pretty close by, and basically the Finger Lakes are wine tourism supported. I think it's the kind of thing that could really do well.

Although Respondent 4 considers the location to be an asset, he was careful to note that land would also be the most difficult piece of a business plan to achieve:

The land is going to be the hardest thing to find. A lot of it is all wrapped up already, and people who have it aren't particularly interested in letting it go. So you're going to have to go in there and give them an offer they can't refuse as far as money goes if you want to, if they want to. The infrastructure itself is fairly readily available. I think they could probably get that done. I think it's going to be buying the property.

Although he notes that it is possible to acquire the land, access to capital will be integral to securing a piece of property in areas that are already heavily wine-supported. Even members of tribes based in the Midwest acknowledge that tribes in existing wine regions are likely to have more success with this sort of business. Respondent 2 notes that:

It would have to be location based, so given the little bit I know of winery business, if there were tribes in the Nevada/California area where we already have tons and tons of grapes being grown, or some of the Eastern tribes - there are a lot of vineyards that way as well.

His perception of tribally operated wineries' viability is most optimistic when they are located in an existing wine region. The tribes in these areas without their own land approach this problem differently than tribes with existing property. Respondent 10 was concerned with the functional nature of the land currently owned by his tribe:

I know there are some Oklahoma wineries but I don't know of any in our area, so I don't know if it would be viable. I would have to find out more and whether there are any vineyards accessible to Cherokee land. Would they grow here?

His concern was whether the land could produce the necessary crops, and he expressed a desire for more information on this subject. Respondent 6 notes that a large percentage of tribally owned land is a current asset possessed by her tribe, which could lead to successful diversification of tribal enterprises. She describes this diversification in terms of integrating existing operations with a vineyard to develop a self-supporting system:

And they have big enough numbers to produce a lot. It wouldn't be a tiny little 25 bottle a year thing. It wouldn't be a land problem. There's lots of Cherokee tribal land that they could do. And even silly little things like they have a buffalo farm. They have a farm that the buffalo are there and they're not farming them for meat, but they could use fertilizer from the buffalo on their grape crop to make the wine and they could incorporate this stuff and it could all be a big interlinked – between the casinos and that – I mean it could just all weave together like a beautifully woven Cherokee basket. What a pretty picture! I think it would be really neat. They could do so much for it and it would only make sense to me.

Her argument that a range of enterprises within her tribe could link together as an interlocked system “like a beautifully woven Cherokee basket” represents her perception of the great value of connectedness in her tribe's enterprises, as she had previously proudly described Cherokee woven baskets as a part of her heritage that was close to the hearts of her tribe's members.

In addition to the reputation of the area around the land and the availability and quality of the land itself, Respondents 7 and 9 discussed the population surrounding a potential tribally owned winery. Respondent 9 was concerned with the idea of a winery on the reservation where

she lived, because she believed it made alcohol too accessible to the already at-risk population, and normalized drinking in the minds of the reservation youth:

Is it located on the reservation? Because then, especially with our already statistics, and then what if that turned into, it raises the statistics of alcoholism, of violence and abuse, then it just helps the everlasting circle that's already going on in our reservation, in our communities, and you know we're the highest number of alcoholism, we're the highest number of incarcerated, we're the highest number of suicides, and it's just going to contribute to that. It would go backwards, you know, but I want that number to come down.

She was more supportive of a winery located off-reservation, where the primary tribal population would be insulated from potential negative consequences of winery operation. Conversely, Respondent 7 felt that there was a better opportunity for this sort of business in areas with reservations than where Native Americans live in the general population:

I think other tribes, especially in California where tribes are intermingled in huge metropolitan areas, like LA. There's little niches of reservations in LA or Phoenix, AZ, or Flagstaff. I think those tribes might do better because there is such, because people have that grand dreams of Native Americans still, because there's reservations still and they're not so integrated. So here they say "Oh he's just some old Native American growing grapes." But there, it would be reservation, and there's way more need for it there and way more opportunity to sell here.

He describes the novelty of being Native American in a larger non-Native population as a differentiating factor that would set a tribal wine product apart from competitors. Additionally, he notes that it would be a better business interest because of the shipping and marketing opportunities that would exist in a location different from his own:

And you would have to ship a lot of wine, you know Northwest Arkansas is big, but it would be a lot of exporting. To California, to Dallas, to the big cities. The tribes on the west coast that are already in those spots, I think that would be a less risky venture because they're already there. People in Hollywood you know would be like, "Oh if you buy this wine, then there's Native American kids on the reservation" And you could do that, you could say hey, our wine supports our school systems on the reservation.

Respondent 7's conceptualization of marketing products to metropolitan consumers who are interested in the giving aspect of their purchases is a type of cause marketing that he imagines

would be successful based on consumers' culturally ingrained stereotypes of the Native American population.

Matters of state and the United States wine market. Seven respondents, or 70% of interviewees, discussed the importance of the US wine market and state regulations in making a business decision to diversify into winery operation. Respondent 2 perceived common sense as the key to making the correct business decision:

If the wine business in general is doing good, then it probably looks like a good idea. If it sees growth in that business, then that would be a good place to invest their time and effort. If it's sitting still or it's getting bad, then why would you?

It makes sense to monitor the wine market in general and make decisions based on its performance. Respondent 7 felt that capturing even a small portion of the market would likely pay off for his tribe:

So I'm sure they'll be like hey it's a billion-dollar market! Even if we got 10% of it, that's a lot of money. Even if we got 1% of it, that's a lot of money for our tribe. A 1% share in a billion-dollar market, it would be smart to do that. If you start at 1% then it's only going to grow.

His perception of the potential for growth in the market was a major factor in how he perceived the potential benefits to the business. Respondent 3 describes living in what is "essentially the Napa Valley" area. She explained that based on her experience, "there doesn't seem to be a large Native interest or presence in that field. I would be interested in seeing that." From articles such as *Native Wineries Take Root* (2013), a Native interest in wine production is relatively recent and may not have reached mass awareness at this time. Respondent 4 perceives "anything associated with the hospitality market" to be a smart business venture, given what he knows about the current market trends, however he notes that "it's awful hard to export B&B rooms – it's a lot easier to ship crates of wine." His belief is that it would be easier to reach a larger customer base with a consumable product. Respondent 8 echoes the contention that a

consumable product would be a better business venture for tribal enterprises. She describes the current issues that tribal members in her area are coping with:

And already people are discussing what happens when casinos are no longer allowed because there are still almost 100 non-recognized tribes in California. What are they going to do for economic development? So wine and alcohol has always been a big thing, and despite the fact that we have problems with it, it's going to be something that's looked at as economic development because it's a sustainable product, it's a consumable.

The steady revenue source described by Respondent 8 is perceived as being important to both tribes and state governments. On the east coast, Respondent 4 acknowledges that “the current legal situations as far as that goes – the state people at least are very favorable to these wineries because they bring a lot of money and revenue into the state.” The perception that the state department would take an interest in tribal winery revenue was also described by Respondent 10. He felt that the state would not set roadblocks to tribes pursuing winery operation if there was a way that the state budget could benefit:

Oh, it would probably depend on the revenue base. If they thought they could make a dollar on it or tax it or not give money to the tribes. If they were, you know, if they could defund another program because they have this instead.

His perception was that the state organization would support tribal enterprises as a way to redirect state funds away from the designated programs, which would result in maintaining tribal revenue at the current level despite additional funds brought in through winery operation.

Respondents 6 and 7, however, felt that previously negotiated circumstances at the state level for tribal businesses would benefit the tribe's diversification into winery operation. Respondent 7 described his perception that “I think they could get, you know how they get the tax breaks on the cigarettes and different liquor licenses, and probably loophole some other things that the federal government would let them because they're on sovereign land.” Their perception is that,

rather than the state government taking advantage of tribal revenue, legal conditions likely exist that would be a boon to tribal winery operation.

Being new/novel. Of the 10 interviewees, 90% indicated that a tribally owned winery was an entirely new idea to them. Four of the participants in this category had initial strong positive feelings, one had a negative reaction, and four were neutral, citing both pros and cons to the concept. Respondent 6's response was overwhelmingly positive, and she expressed a desire to support tribes pursuing this avenue:

I think it's a great idea and I can't believe anyone hasn't mentioned it or even thought of a tribally owned winery before and I think it's brilliant. It's something I can see happening even stemming from your research. Tribes might decide to implement it later on – even if not my own tribe then other tribes – Choctaw has lots of casinos and they're growing all the time so there's always that option even if it's not my own tribe. Even if it wasn't my own tribe but it was a tribally owned wine, it's something I would at least buy a couple bottles of to try. I just think it's a great idea.

It was her perception that the only barrier for tribes entering the wine industry was a lack of awareness of this new trend in tribal enterprises, and the literature does suggest that these business decisions are fairly recent (Kettmann, 2013). Respondent 7 perceived tribally operated wineries as a new business venture that would likely be copied when a successful formula arises. While he had not heard of such an idea, his perception of human nature led him to believe that the idea could become reality:

I think it'll, you know, I've never thought about tribal wineries before. But I think it'll be, because we live in a nation where people are like, oh they built the iPhone? I want to build a phone too. They came out with a movie about toys? I'm gonna...so it's like copycat industry. So I think so, once they see it as a sustainable income, and like I said now that people are more, I think social drinking is more acceptable now. I just think so. You see wine more in Walmart when you never saw wine in Walmart. I think it's just more accepted. I think there's very smart people that run Nations and they'll see they're missing an opportunity here.

While he had previously noted on the subject of new businesses that he “would like to hope that there's somebody smart enough they'd have already figured that out,” the above statement

indicated that over the course of the interview, his thinking developed such that he believed it was possible his Nation's leaders had not been introduced the idea to fully consider it yet. The single interviewee who was familiar with tribally owned wineries was still neutral and actively gathering information with her tribal members, but she spoke of new and novel approaches that she believed would be the cornerstone of a successful operation:

And then we've also looked at non-Native enterprises that are doing things differently, like all over the place. And Napa is a hotbed for outside-the-box thinking and the small scale farm to fork being really successful... We just need, we just need something, like a unique niche to fall into.

In the course of her tribe's information-gathering pursuit, they have considered not that a winery as a tribal enterprise was a new concept, but that in their area, where a significant amount of competition exists, it must be done in a new way:

So doing wine in nontraditional ways, like in Napa I know of a family, they raise organic sheep as a weed control in their vineyard. They raise chickens and ducks as weed and bug control. So there's a lot of different things that you can do, and you can do it in a nontraditional, so to speak, way, and you can do it better.

Her description of a novel approach to vineyard operation mirrored Respondent 6's description of interrelated enterprises as a "beautifully woven Cherokee basket." This suggests that the opportunity exists for tribes to merge multiple tribal enterprises in a symbiotic relationship and use this relationship as both a method of conserving resources and a differentiating factor in the United State wine market.

Perceived Benefits of Tribal Winery Operations. Of the ten respondents, nine identified benefits to the tribe outside of business diversification, including increased tribal revenue for programs, keeping the tribal community close, employment opportunities, and establishing the presence of Native American individuals in the modern era.

Increased tribal revenue. Respondents 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, or 80% of interviewees, noted that increased tribal revenue was an important benefit that a tribally operated winery could provide. The assertion that revenue could be a benefit was the only balancing factor for neutrality for Respondent 1, who felt that a tribally operated winery could provide “um, more funding for programs, um, and that’s pretty much it.” The other respondents were more optimistic about the opportunity for tribal revenue and the support it could provide to tribal programs and therefore the population.

Respondent 6 in particular was optimistic about the prospect of increased income, saying “The money they make, they could funnel it back into the schools, that money can go all over. Healthcare, schools, there’s just so many places they could benefit from what they earn from this.” The programs offered by her tribe (Cherokee Nation) require millions of dollars in annual funding. The Cherokee Nation spent \$74.4 million dollars on services and programs for tribal members in fiscal year 2015 (*Where the Casino Money Goes*, 2016). The opportunity for additional funding and support through additional tribal enterprises was of key importance as a result of the large-scale yearly expenditures made by her tribe. Respondent 10 also perceived the benefit of additional revenue to the tribe, as a way to “continue the housing projects or the education projects or the elderly projects, something like that. Just increased revenue would be it [the biggest benefit] in my opinion.” In multiple instances like those above, increased tribal revenue was mention in tandem with an increased ability to provide programs to at-risk tribal members.

Keeping the tribal community close. This demonstration of community spirit was regarded as a primary benefit to tribal winery operation by Respondent 8. While her tribe is

much smaller, it was also historically a very close-knit group, and changes in the last generation have resulted in an impact felt acutely by more traditional tribal members:

Keeping those jobs here is also preventing the whole next generation of... They're needing to move away. They're needing to move for those jobs and for school and all of that, because our very small band... There's colleges that are close to here, but it's just such a new focus, and it's such an adjustment I think in one generation that hasn't happened yet. And keeping these traditional ag jobs is a big deal for the younger kids that, they're not making that shift yet. So, it has far-reaching implications as far as it's not just the ag and keeping the jobs for them. It's keeping our community close. Once you separate us... So yeah, it's a big connector factor to have everybody together and have everybody go into that line of work.

Respondent 8 perceived that her tribe's strength came from their connection, and a way to facilitate that in younger generations was to create local jobs that would allow younger tribal members to stay geographically close by. Historically, she described that her band lived communally. This was still the primary living arrangement in her childhood, so over the course of "just 40 short years," a fundamental tribal dynamic shifted, and she perceived that the shift destabilized their connection with each other. In this instance, the primary benefit of tribal winery operation is seen as a chance to provide resources and opportunities locally to keep members from seeking better futures elsewhere.

Employment opportunities. Along with respondent 8, respondents 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 (70% of interviewees) also identified the importance of jobs for tribal members. Respondents 6, 9, and 10 believed that the jobs would be valuable in their areas if the hiring processes offered employment preference to Native American candidates (Respondent 8 referred to this as "Native-preference"). Respondent 6 felt that:

The jobs alone would be amazing because there are so many people still that have no jobs, and in our area where there are so many tribally owned businesses, if you're Native American there should be no problem getting a job if you want it.

While the other respondents who mentioned jobs as a benefit to tribal winery operation did not explicitly state that Native-preference in hiring practices would be a benefit, it was implied by their discussion of job creation for tribal members. The exception to this is found in Respondent 7's discussion of the benefits of tribal wineries. While he did mention revenue and jobs for tribal members as a benefit, his perception revenue and employment benefits expanded to include individuals living in his region:

That [opening a tribally operated winery] means the value of land will go up, because I think we do have really good land around here for that kind of growth. So that means that people that have good land, it'll bring some good value in land, so maybe that'll cause people to make a little bit more money maybe instead of people leasing money for cow fields, you know, which is not a very good money maker. They could lease those same fields to wineries or to the Nation or whoever was doing it, and that would increase maybe some farmers type, maybe create a few jobs. There would be revenue.

Respondent 7 had previously discussed the Native American population in his area living as fully integrated members of the local population, so this likely informed his perception of the range of benefits. In this way, the tribe has a positive impact on the entire region, which could have a secondary positive impact on tribal members as the local economy flourishes.

Establishing the presence of Native Americans in the modern era. While Respondent 7 speaks of interactions between Native American individuals and other residents of his area as being commonplace, the singular benefit that Respondent 3 identified for her coastal tribe was establishing a tribal presence:

Getting a tribal name out there and your own tribal interests. I think it would be good for the indigenous community at large just to show that, uh, there is still a presence of Native Americans. We're not just in the past, we have current and future projections. In our area, it's just smallish tribal communities but a lot of them. Having a specific name out there is incredibly beneficial... We are a small tribe and we're always looking for expanding knowledge and awareness that we're there and we have a name.

The benefits of awareness and education have long been necessary connecting factors between Native and non-Native communities, and the fundamental nature of these benefits would likely be foundational to successful tribal winery operation.

Perceived Barriers to Success of Tribally Owned Wineries. All 10 respondents were able to identify barriers to tribal winery operation. The most commonly cited issues were social resistance and the negative stereotype associated with Native Americans and alcohol, although issues of resources, delayed gratification, and authenticity were also identified.

Social resistance. Eight respondents (80% of interviewees) felt that a tribally owned winery would encounter social resistance at some stage of operation. These comments ranged from full identification of the resistance to a broad description of resistance as a potential - not necessarily given - barrier to tribal winery operation. Respondents 1 and 9 anchor their belief that social resistance would be justified through consideration of the health of tribal members.

Respondent 1 believed that:

They want a healthier Nation and a healthier tribe, versus a bad image. And any alcohol would be unfavorable to the positive image of the tribe and of their people. Because they want good people in the tribe and raise them all up good.

In her estimation, alcohol was not consistent with the values of the tribe or the features they desire to cultivate in their membership. Alcohol in any form would introduce a point of weakness in her estimation. She did address that casinos currently serve alcohol, but was quick to mitigate her perception of that venture with a description of the social programs made possible by those funds. This sort of cognitive dissonance was a common theme as respondents considered the concept of a Native-owned winery. Of the respondents who reported their overall opinion of winery operation as neutral, 4 out of 5 did so as a result of a similar thought process. Respondent 9, who was the sole overall negative opinion, has experienced controversy in her tribe

concerning the current casino operations. She stated that her opinion of tribally owned wineries was because “there’s already a lot of statistics that say our tribe has a lot of drug and alcohol problems, and that would just feed into the problems.” She shared that she had worked in social programs early in her career, and those experiences shaped her perception of alcohol-based enterprises. Respondent 10 worried that characterizing wineries as a positive tribal enterprise would send the wrong message to the tribe’s youth. He felt that “seeing it, the younger generations could say, ‘Hey, it’s alright to have wine’ rather than the beer or the, you know, harder liquor.” He felt that tribal winery operation would normalize alcohol consumption, which was a particular concern “with the knowledge of how some of the tribe members have abused the use of alcohol.”

Respondents 5 and 6 cited resistance based on health concerns within the tribe. Respondent 5 simply stated that “probably the number one challenge would be the idea that some tribes do suffer from alcoholism, and it can impact other health issues that they may be more susceptible to, such as diabetes.” Similarly, Respondent 6 notes these issues but mitigated the severity of the barrier with a description of moderation and personal responsibility:

You have also the health issues with Native Americans having a high instance of fatty liver disease and alcoholism, as a rule. The tribe would have to deal with that. But then there are the health benefits of wine – there’s moderation. And that’s the key with any person is moderation. You have to – if you’re not doing something in moderation then that has to be on you and not on your tribe because they bottled your wine. It’s like smoking. They may sell the cigarettes but they don’t force you to smoke them. It’s just something they have to take it in moderation and they have to know just because they do this doesn’t mean that they’re necessarily the one contributing.

In addition to identifying the barrier of likely social resistance based on public health concerns, her assertion that wine offers some health benefits and that individuals must be personally responsible for their actions offered insight into potential avenues for addressing these challenges.

Both Respondent 2 and Respondent 7 identified the concept of “cultural backlash” from alcohol-related Native American business enterprises. Respondent 7 was personally connected to the causes of social resistance, as she shared that:

The cultural backlash – it’s just. It’s just such an ingrained thing in culture and Native American culture with alcohol. My own mother committed suicide when we were kids because of alcoholism.

She was deeply connected to this potential barrier, and she described the Native American population as “simultaneously having the highest rate of alcoholism and highest rate of abstaining from alcohol.” As a member of the abstainers, she demonstrates that such impactful events can empower others to make changes in their own generation. With this experience shaping her adult identity, she is a careful and thoughtful researcher as her tribe actively considers operation of a winery. Respondent 2 was not personally connected to the barrier and was less familiar with the actual statistics of alcoholism, but he considered cultural backlash a likely result:

So the idea of an Indian owner period or a tribe in general doing any business that’s directly alcohol-related as its primary thing, seems like that could catch some negative, some real backlash from people. I don’t think that’s actually a thing or actually a problem, but it might be that perception that would impact your bottom line.

Respondent 2’s belief is that, whether real or imagined, the perception of an at-risk population operating an alcohol-based enterprise could impact the potential success of the business.

Respondent 9 described controversy based on selling alcohol in the course of casino operation in her tribe, but other respondents from tribes with casinos had not necessarily experienced an impact firsthand. In fact, some respondents mentioned gaming revenue being a great financial support to tribal programs. Whether actual or perceived, these barriers are an important consideration as tribes work to make an informed decision.

The final dimension of social resistance identified by respondents was based on values and religious beliefs. Respondent 7 described the social climate toward alcohol in his area of the country:

I think, because we live in the Bible Belt, which I consider myself a Christian, but in the Bible Belt you'll have a lot of people seeing wine as this big alcohol thing, but you know most wine is a very low point alcohol and it's not like a hard liquor or a high point alcohol so like, I don't get that. But I think the majority of people around here would. They'd say, "Oh they're making booze over there!" I mean, we even have counties next door to us in Arkansas that used to be dry counties, and I think there's still a lot of that mindset.

While it is possible to drink abusively regardless of the alcohol content of the product being consumed, there is a precedent for Native-owned wineries focusing on creating a quality, low alcohol content wine that does well in the marketplace (Kettmann, 2013). Education and transparency will likely be key to gaining public support both in the midwestern areas that comprise the "Bible Belt" and among tribal communities.

Stereotypes concerning Native Americans. Distinct from the social resistance identified above, whose key consideration is public health in Native populations, stereotypes of Native Americans and alcohol stem from a culturally ingrained stigmatization of tribal populations. While the term "stereotype" was used by some respondents in their description of possible social resistance, the follow-up description was used to divide considerations between the former and current categorizations. In essence, the difference is that social resistance was identified by the researcher as coming from within the tribe, and the perceived barrier of stereotyping comes from individuals outside of the tribe. Respondent 2 identified the stereotype based on his experience with tribal casinos, because "It seems like I once heard of some big outcry that the people who were running casinos were Indians and with all that alcohol that seems crazy." Based on this experience, he believed that stereotyping was likely to exist as a barrier to winery operation. He

explained that perception of Native Americans as alcoholics is a “genetic, or perhaps only social, or perhaps only fictional” problem that will exist in public perception if not in reality.

Respondent 8 identified that “there’s a lot of education” that needs to go into Native American issues. In her area, she has noticed that

Just having Native American on a label is an automatic bias. In my area, it’s an automatic negative. It’s automatic that, when people think about a Native American winery, it’s not the traditional image of something that would be very classy, that people with money are going to go to and they’re going to want to enjoy themselves or anything. The first thing they picture around here is that “Oh shit, there’s a bunch of drunken Indians.” So it’s a lot of marketing work.

She described the tribally owned winery she is familiar with in her area. They are careful to avoid labels that are overtly connected to the tribe or the casino operations. This demonstration of a negative stereotype affecting an otherwise acceptable product is a barrier that requires careful strategic management of the brand.

The public’s perception of Native American individuals in the modern era still demonstrates flaws, as evidenced by the experiences of Respondents 6 and 6. Respondent 6 explained that the “big thing is the stereotype of the drunk Indian... You know, everybody kind of assumes that.” Respondent 8 described media as an early influencer and reinforcer of this stereotype. She felt that “even the cartoons from the 1940’s and things, the black and white cartoons, it was always the Indians with the jugs.” The images were pervasive, and as a result of prolonged exposure, Respondent 8 felt that “that image is like burned into the American psyche and it’s really hard to get around.” As Native Americans grapple with maintaining their traditions and heritage in the modern day (a concept discussed in more detail in the section *Preservation of Heritage*), they are faced with archaic mindsets that directly affect how they are treated by others. Respondent 6 described the experience of defending her identity and lifestyle in an online interaction:

People still picture us living in teepees and, uh. I had a guy once ask me how I got wifi in my teepee, and I was beyond offended. People are stupid – I was playing an online game and he found out I’m from Oklahoma and I’m an Indian, and he went back to the 1800s. And I said I live in a house just like you, you know, you’re just living in the dark ages – open a book. Another thing is that I think if people educate themselves a little bit, those stereotypes and those hindrances, they would see there’s no need to feel them. They’re more perceived than they are real.

Discussion of this barrier in terms of being “more perceived than...real” and “genetic or...social or...fictional” emerged as a strategy through which respondents addressed the stereotypes while simultaneously distancing themselves from them.

Respondent 8 experienced firsthand the need for public awareness of modern tribal members. She spoke of a recent time when she was traveling up and down California to advocate for Native American water rights, and she “had people in my face angry as hell telling me I was a liar, that there were no more Native Americans.” This is a particularly compelling lack of awareness, especially when considering that California, with a population size of 362,801, has the highest number of individual Native American residents of any state in the US (Miller, 2015). This is similar to Respondent 6’s identification of a need to educate others about the lives of modern tribal members and Respondent 2’s citation of the primary benefit to tribal winery operation as promoting awareness of the fact that Native Americans are “not just in the past” but have “current and future projections” in our country. As identified by interviewees, a gap currently exists between mainstream society’s media-based or historical perception of Native Americans and their contemporary reality that must be addressed through education and communication.

Resources and Delayed Gratification. Issues of infrastructure and delayed gratification were additional barriers identified by respondents. Respondent 3 believed “there would be a lot of need for outside resources,” which could be an issue when a tribe looks to develop an

enterprise based on their current strengths and resources. While Respondent 4 did not believe these would be huge issues, he also identified that the biggest potential barrier to his tribe is “mostly going to be an infrastructure issue. It’s more going to be ‘Do you have the area to grow the grapes and do you have the equipment to turn it into wine?’”

When discussing the process of pursuing a winery with her tribe, Respondent 8 noted that resources such as seed money and location were pieces of the puzzle that needed to fall into place before moving forward. In this process, discussions of instant gratification have taken place as a response to diversification discussions. In her tribe, they have noted that “there is this whole generation of kids who have grown up with this instant gratification of casinos.” The expectation that enterprises will move quickly from the planning phase to inception is a frustration for self-described traditionalists such as Respondent 8. She described the current developments around her area in California:

I think more so now with us than with other generations just because everything is so instant gratification and it’s so fast. When you make the decision to build a new housing development, it’s all pre-fab along the Sacramento corridor down there, and it’s up in a week. It’s completely devastated the landscape and put this whole new thing in that’s going to be there and things will never be the same. You can try to get them back to somewhat functional, like, before the housing development, but it’s so fast now. Your decisions are just instant.

The decision makers’ lack of regard for the landscape in their traditionally agricultural area is a point of contention that Respondent 8 speaks passionately against. She feels strongly that new enterprises in their area should have an agricultural foundation, and that is why they are considering a tribally owned winery. This does not meet the younger members’ preference for a speedy turnaround, however.

Respondent 7 similarly recognized the long-term nature of an investment in wine and felt it would be a barrier:

I mean like, yes, our tribe is in very impoverished counties. I think it would be very hard to get that because that's an extensive, I mean I've been around people that's grown grapes and had wineries before, and it's not like just a regular vegetable garden. It takes a lot of investment, a lot of upfront investment, and you've got to wait a long time before you see a return on that investment. So, I think it would be hard for people in our tribe to do that because I would say 45% of our tribal members are impoverished in our area I guess.

Rather than identifying the “instant gratification” mindset as an issue when working with younger tribe members, it was the impoverished members in Respondent 7's scenario who would have trouble ascertaining the value of a long-term business investment. The need to provide essentials for tribe members could potentially drive business decision makers in the direction of investments with quicker turnarounds, because, as Respondent 7 puts it:

A winery, to grow real good grapes, it takes a long investment you know what I'm saying. To have a real good vineyard takes years and years of sitting back and watching it grow, and I think that's tough. I think it's tough because, like, you know what happens if drought and disease? It just brings a lot of doubt to people that are used to easy investments and easy returns.

The length of the initial investment also contributes to a greater perceived risk, because of the possibility of uncontrollable factors associated with acts of nature. Tribes in need of assistance to get started and tribes with readily available resources and diverse business interests will likely have different perceptions of the seriousness of these barriers as they seek to best support their membership.

Authenticity. Perceived authenticity in winery operation has been established as an important potential barrier to successful operation (Kim & Bon, 2016; Robinson & Clifford, 2012), and this topic was addressed by Respondents 2 and 7. Both respondents felt like a more authentic avenue to tribal business diversification would be successful, because there was not a historical connection to winery operation of which they were aware. Respondent 2 explained that:

It doesn't seem like a Native American business enterprise. Wineries seem like something that would be a European thing, so a tribe running one, while it's fine, it seems like it might be hard for them to tie in the tribal history/Indian business side of it into the winery side of it – putting those two together, you could do it, though there doesn't seem to be a synergy there.

While acknowledging that there was no inherent problem with the tribe engaging in this business, the lack of “synergy” has potential as a barrier when considered in the context of authentic enterprises. Respondent 7 notes that “I’m sure Indians made some kind of booze, but it ain’t like Cherokees are known for grapes.” As a result of this disconnect between the operation and the tribe, he believes that “it would be tough to say ‘Here’s a way we can guarantee sales’ or ‘Here’s a way we can say this is a good thing.’ I think it would be a real risk.” Both respondents noted that there were likely other authentic operations where the tribe had more credibility.

Respondent 2 felt that a business with a tie-in to heritage was more reasonable:

For instance, like a basket weaving or a leather type business that has an obvious tribal tie in. And I say obvious, like obvious to most other non-Native type populations. There’s no obvious match [with wineries]. It’s not like our history is like “this, this, this, this, this” and there’s a recipe [for wine] from so far back. It just doesn’t tie in.

Since products will likely be distributed in largely non-Native markets, he asserted that credibility will come from a business with a strong connection to tribal culture. Likewise,

Respondent 2 felt that the disconnect between wine and tribal culture weakened its viability in the marketplace:

If making wine was part of the Cherokee heritage like fry bread was or like beaded necklaces was, you know people would be like, “Oh I want...” You know like turquoise was to the Navajos – they been doing sterling silver and turquoise jewelry for a hundred years. So there’s that little – I think it would be tough to say Cherokees are good at selling wine, because there’s no tie to history.

The barrier addressed here is that the perceived quality of the product would be lower as a result of the lack of credibility in the field. While it is possible that this reputation would be built upon development and execution of quality products, it is a fundamental issue that decision makers

should be aware of in initial considerations. This will allow for creation of a strategy to address the potential problem head-on.

The role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage. Themes of heritage and agriculture emerged through discussion with the two California-based respondents. Concepts identified were tribal history, preservation of heritage, and preservation of the land.

Tribal history. While the connection between midwestern tribal members and the wine industry is considered to have a lack of “synergy” because the two parties have not historically intersected, this is not the case for the California-based respondents. For Respondent 3, the history of her tribe and the wine industry is the first thing that comes to mind. She had a negative association with wineries in her area because of the way early operations were conducted:

This land they operate on, we were chose and we were used as slaves. It was just all up and down Napa Valley. We were the ones who set the original posts that are still there. The rows and the lines for all the wineries and vineyards – that was us, making perfect lines.

When she considers the wineries, the remnant of her ancestors’ work is the factor that most clearly presents itself. The pain her people experienced as a result of this enterprise rightfully colors her opinion, but she remains supportive of Native populations should they choose to enter the industry. Members of Respondent 8’s tribe also worked the early wineries in in California “from when the wineries went in until maybe the late 80’s when most of that kind of stopped.” The difference between the experiences of the two tribes, however, is that for Respondent 8’s tribe, the work was out of necessity rather than compulsion:

Lots of our family and our tribe, we’re a very small band, they traveled to the central valley for work. That’s all there was. In the vineyards and in agriculture in general. [Wineries] were the big hirers, and we couldn’t get a lot of jobs in like offices or jobs that required higher education or a degree. So they did stringing for hops and they did stringing for grapes. They put the poles in. They tilled the ground, they planted the grapes, they harvested the grapes.

Rather than having a painful association with early winery operations, Respondent 8 spoke proudly of the work completed by previous generations of her tribe. She interpreted the time they spent primarily as agricultural workers as a strength in maintaining their closeness and preserving their heritage.

Preservation of heritage. Extending her discussion of previous generations' agricultural work, Respondent 8 speaks of her childhood and the way that agricultural work contributed to the strength of the family:

We didn't really have friends outside our family. It was a huge family and it was just us, and they went to work in the same fields and in the same area. The men worked in the woods in the logging industry. The women went further down in the valley and they would camp and stay and work in the fields.

During the interview, Respondent 8 described the recent death of her aunt, and how her extended family had all come together for the first time in years. This distance has been a frequent topic of discussion among family members who have seen an exodus from traditional tribal areas in search of other opportunities:

The younger generation has moved to different places. There's a huge disconnect...that the last probably decade we've been working to bring all of our family back together. The agriculture industry really did keep us together to a certain extent.

This consideration has been a large part of her tribe's decision to pursue information about winery operation. They believe an agricultural enterprise would provide opportunities to members in their area, thereby keeping them closer to home and helping them maintaining strong tribal and familial bonds. This relationship is not only important to Respondent 8's familial relations, but also to the strength of the tribe, as she described "Being close with your tribe and your family is just such a huge important deal for keeping your traditions together and keeping your culture alive." The opportunity to pass on pieces of heritage through closer relationships

aids in the preservation of traditions and the “communal living” that used to be an everyday part of tribal life:

So yeah, it's a big connector factor to have everybody together and have everybody go into that line of work. A lot of older generation, like my mom's generation, they were sitting around after the funeral. I brought my mom's photo album and they were talking about “Oh yeah, this is when we were down there working on um, the tomato farm” and “down here” and “blah blah blah.” And they were just down there working, the family would stay together. And then you knew other families from other areas that were doing the same things. And come ceremony times, everybody was really close because they had worked together all summer.

The camaraderie that resulted from closer work within their family and with other tribal families on agricultural endeavors directly contributed to the fellowship felt during meaningful tribal ceremonies. In Respondent 8's estimation, the occasion to preserve their heritage diminishes as physical distance grows between tribal members. It was important to Respondent 8's tribe to pursue a business venture that both preserves tribal heritage by keeping members connected and preserves the environment through working the land.

Preservation of the land. Respondent 8's area of California is traditionally “such a huge ag area,” but “with development and housing and the strip malls and all of that, ag's really taken a backseat.” With the established tribal history and perceived value set on agricultural enterprises, more traditional tribal members are “looking for ways to use it as the main component of their communities, and so tribes are looking at vineyards.” Whereas Respondent 3 considered the potentially negative “ecological impact of a winery” to be a key factor for consideration, Respondent 8's tribe viewed winery operation as “an economic help and an ecological preservation measure.” Respondent 8 described losing important features of the land that supported her tribe:

Talking about how nobody is looking at saving all of this land - that is being developed so fast - for agriculture, because that's what was here. And traditionally, our traditional agriculture was there, and we're losing our plants. We're losing all of our traditional

foods and our medicines that were growing in these areas. We've lost one whole area that used to be volcanic rocks for sweat, and now it's all shopping malls. It's just gone.

She explained the difficulty in saving land to use it for agriculture, even though agricultural pursuits are traditional to that area. The public perception that she describes is that if the land isn't being developed for physical businesses, then they "aren't doing anything with it." The use of land for agriculture is considered a waste of valuable real estate because the value of agricultural development is not evident to those in the surrounding population. She said that, "it's really hard to convince people that just not building anything else there and burning and separating and replanting is important for the plants and the existing ecosystem." In addition to the necessary cultural awareness identified by the barrier of stereotyping, there is a direct need for education on the importance of agriculture, both monetary and ecological, and the processes required for crops to flourish.

Research Question 2

RQ2. What are the perceptions of non-involved Native American individuals toward the use of Native American icons or symbols on tribally owned winery products for marketing purposes?

Research Question 2 was addressed through statistical analysis of hypothesis 2, and qualitative exploration of the marketing categories of geography, ceremonial dress, historic figures, animals, totems, writing in a tribal language, and meaningful objects.

Hypothesis 2

Non-involved participants will rate acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced wine products on a Likert scale as a measure of less than neutral.

In order to address Hypothesis 2, mean scores were calculated for each of the marketing categories that appeared on the survey. These categories were rated from 1 to 5 on a Likert scale according to how acceptable or unacceptable they would be for use to market a tribally produced winery product. The ratings were: 1 = completely unacceptable, 2 = somewhat unacceptable, 3 = neither acceptable nor unacceptable, 4 = somewhat acceptable, and 5 = completely acceptable.

The categories were described as:

- Geography (examples include historic sites, hills, trees, or other natural formations)
- Ceremonial dress (examples include headdresses, beadwork, tribal prints, or other wearable items)

- Native American historic figures (examples include Chief Crazy Horse, Sacagawea, Sequoyah, or others)
- Animals (examples include owls, bears, falcons, buffalo, or others)
- Totems (examples include spirit beings, sacred objects, or symbols)
- Writing in a tribal language (examples include the Cherokee syllabary and symbolic language such as pictographs)
- Meaningful tribal objects (examples include dream catchers, peace pipes, teepees or other housing, painted pots or other art, or other items)

The average ratings for each category are displayed in Table 30, with geography ($M = 3.92$), animals ($M = 3.87$), and tribal writing ($M = 3.73$) scoring the highest on the acceptability scale. This indicates that these three categories would be the least controversial for a tribe to use for marketing purposes. Meaningful tribal objects fell in the middle of the score range ($M = 3.48$), indicating that it is possible for these to be used in an acceptable way for marketing. Ceremonial dress ($M = 3.15$) and Native American historic figures ($M = 3.01$) each scored neutrally on the scale. The final category was the only one that scored as a measure of less than neutral. Totems had a mean score of 2.83, putting them below the neutral cutoff of 3 on the scale. This indicates that marketing using spirit beings, sacred objects, and symbols was largely regarded as unacceptable by the survey respondents.

Table 30

<i>Appropriateness of Marketing Categories</i>			
	M	SD	N
Geography	3.92	1.15	131
Ceremonial Dress	3.15	1.47	131
NA Historic Figures	3.01	1.50	131
Animals	3.87	1.24	131
Totems	2.83	1.43	131
Tribal Writing	3.73	1.26	131
Meaningful Objects	3.48	1.33	131

Research Question 2: Qualitative Analysis

Marketing. For the category of marketing, responses were divided into the categories of geography, ceremonial dress, historic figures, animals, totems, writing in a tribal language, and meaningful objects. Within each category, the key themes are presented.

Geography. The themes of shopping local, connection to nature, area reputation, and possible negative considerations emerged. Respondent 10 discussed the idea that tying a product to the state or region where it was produced would be advantageous because it demonstrates that, by purchasing that product, you are supporting the local economy. He felt that marketing a product in this way sent the message that “we recognize that [product] as being part of our culture and part of our community.” The connection between the local community and the product would, in his estimation, strengthen its market position.

This strength Respondent 10 refers to may not exist outside of the local community, but Respondent 3 and 8 both recognize that marketing with their local area could be advantageous because of their location’s proximity to established wine-producing areas. Respondent 3 described marketing with the local geography as “completely acceptable, and probably helpful...because we’re in the Napa Valley area.” It made sense to both respondents to take advantage of the existing reputation, if possible, in establishing a new product.

For Respondent 6, the connection to geography would be advantageous because it suggests the Native American-produced nature of the wine without overtly stating it. She felt that that people associate Native Americans with the outdoors, so “it’s just a natural way to go for marketing and they just kind of go hand-in-hand.” Respondent 5 also found geography to be relatable because it exists both inside and outside the tribe, although Respondent 7 clarified that the way tribes perceive natural geographical formations could vary based on their history:

The truth is like, Cherokees haven’t been here for a thousand years, we were moved here. So we don’t have like holy sites like the Black Hills, those Native Americans have been there for like a long, long time. So those have more sacred sites where we don’t, I shouldn’t say we don’t, but we don’t see those as much here. So if they took a picture of the Illinois river and put it on a bottle of wine, I don’t think the Cherokees would have a right to say we were offended “because that’s our sacred river.”

The degree to which tribes are tied to geographical elements is an important consideration in determining whether marketing would be advantageous or ill-received. Respondent 8 noted that use of a historic site would likely be acceptable, but sites with a ceremonial element should not be used in marketing. She felt that “if you have this traditional site that’s a traditional ceremony site, you shouldn’t have the site as well as the ceremony going on at the base of it slapped on a bottle of wine.” Respondent 8 believed it would be a tribe-by-tribe decision, with a “gray area” example of having “a picture of this beautiful mountain because it’s significant and this is the economic development that’s going on in this tribe.” In this way, the geographic element is important to the tribe without carrying heavy traditional connotations. Respondent 2 addressed the connotative power of landmarks as well, cautioning that an area could be “associated with any number of injustices” even though the “marker itself is nice.” While he noted that such information would be more readily recognizable to members of the tribe than to those outside, he believed it was still a best practice to avoid marketing with anything as overtly negative as locations along the Trail of Tears (“the Indian equivalent of the holocaust”) or as subtle as “a

town built by taking our people's land." In a tribal context where history and ties to the land are both vitally important and potentially turbulent, marketing with geographic images is not a straightforward endeavor.

Ceremonial dress. The themes of religion and deeper meaning, cultural appropriation, and commodification of culture arose for the category of ceremonial dress. The most common assertion made by respondents was that the use of ceremonial dress in marketing was inappropriate for religious reasons. Respondent 6 noted that, since these items are used in religious ceremonies, it "may not be appropriate...to be displayed on a bottle of wine or in advertising." Respondent 8 felt passionately that marketing with ceremonial dress was "a huge no. Wine is a new thing for Indians that was introduced, and the ceremonial stuff is a whole different category." She considered that a line exists between the appropriate uses of ceremonial dress and marketing of any kind, and that they do not overlap. The time and place for ceremonial dress, according to Respondent 9, is "always sacred and ceremonial, so those things have nothing to do with alcohol." She explained:

If you are Native American and you are marketing stuff that's of tribal, or of, um, traditional, you're allowed to do that. Say if you're a beader or you make regalia. That's fine. That's totally fine if you're marketing that business and it being used for the things it's supposed to be used for, like ceremonies.

In reflecting on marketing with ceremonial dress, she considers it acceptable only if the purposes are true to the traditional uses of those items, such as selling regalia for ceremonies. She believes that marketing with ceremonial dress should "stay true to the original use of the item or honor it." Since wine is not a traditional part of their tribal heritage, marketing with traditional ceremonial dress is, in her view, not appropriate. Respondent 2 considered another perspective on the religious aspect of marketing with ceremonial dress:

There, even if it's your tribe you're doing it with and folks in your tribe feel okay with it, people outside the tribe who know a little bit about American Indians or your tribe specifically might be like "Ooooo." People might find that offensive even if no one in your tribe actually does! It could be perceived as, and it probably would be in most cases, just being sacrilegious. And taking something that has meaning to at least some people and cheapening it.

The idea that those outside the tribal population could potentially be offended by marketing with ceremonial dress suggests that the way consumers perceive the items on the label could be just as important as the reality of the objects' place within the tribe.

Related to the perception of those outside of tribes, Respondent 6 discussed the cultural appropriation of non-tribal members wearing ceremonial dress for Halloween and referring to traditional tribal wear as "costuming" when her daughter donned a traditional tear dress to sing with the Cherokee Nation Choir. She noted that it is important to be "culturally sensitive" in using these items in marketing, but when the tribe has control of how the marketing "they're going to be more likely to know how not to make it offensive versus someone who had no idea. But it's still right there at that line. It's getting close." Tribal officials making these marketing decisions will require a deep knowledge of the traditional elements of tribal beliefs to make decisions that are appropriate to their membership. Respondent 9 felt that the outside population would consider tribal members to be overly sensitive in protecting ceremonial dress from use in marketing, but she asserted that "it means something to us...[people outside the tribe] are never going to understand, and that's fine, but let's just leave that then. Let's agree to disagree and just not do that." Finally, Respondent 4 felt that use of ceremonial dress in marketing was sending the wrong message altogether. His fear was of "trading on" or commodifying his culture:

I think we should sell it based on the quality and not based on who we are. I wouldn't want to sell wine made by the Mohawks as a novelty item. I think it diminishes and takes advantage of the tribe status and demeans it to a certain degree potentially. It changes the focus away from what I think a business model would need. This is a wine company that

just happens to be Mohawk tribe and therefore benefiting the Mohawk tribe, but it is first and foremost a vintner.

He was careful to note that the business model should be focused on producing and distributing a quality product and not marketing based on the tribal affiliation. Whether viewed from within the tribe or outside of the tribe, the appropriateness of marketing in this area should be addressed carefully and with thorough consideration.

Native American historic figures. For this category, the concepts of historic figures' values, honoring memory, and permissions were addressed by respondents. In considering the use of historic figures in marketing, Respondent 2 acknowledged that we do have likenesses on "coins and signs and so forth, but most of those are to honor them and things they did." He asserted that it is significantly different to use these likenesses as "the face of a commercial enterprise to which they almost certainly didn't contribute or approve or disapprove of...it's like, you know, putting words in their historic mouths." Since wine production in this capacity is not a traditional part of most tribes' histories, an actual approval could not be assumed. Respondent 7 felt that putting a Native American historic figure on a piece of currency would be different because "it shows the nations working together." The connection between the historic figure's likeness and marketing suggests endorsement of the product, which Respondent 4 described as "abusing their standing in society." Not only could marketing using a historic figure's likeness be considered an abuse, Respondent 7 noted that "you would need family permission" from descendants. Respondent 10 similarly mentioned this legal detail with his assertion that he would only find marketing with a historic figure acceptable "if you would get direct descendant's permission." These respondents keyed in on the important consideration in the legal battle surrounding Crazy Horse Malt Liquor, which established the need for family permission before historic likenesses were used in marketing (Pommersheim, 2012; Novello, 1993; "Native

Americans speak with one voice against Crazy Horse,” 1992). A big part of the legal right of the descendants to control the use of historic figures likenesses is in maintaining the integrity of their memory. Respondent 1 felt that it was inappropriate to use the likenesses because “that’s not what they stood for.” Her assertion was that marketing winery products would run counter to the values espoused by historic figures. Respondent 8 agreed that the traditional agendas of these individuals did not relate to the wine industry and using their likeness to market such products was therefore inappropriate:

That’s just, I don’t know, because most of our historic figures we look up to would be people who really fought for traditional things. So I can’t see that being, being a positive but that would be up to the tribe. Another thing I think about it “oh my gosh, my grandma would kill me!” That’s a lot of the fight in Indian country nowadays is trying to keep ahead and be so integrated into the business models and resisting and that traditional stuff is really clashing and holy cow, it causes so much strife.

Respondent 8 likens her grandmother serving as her inner guide in protecting her heritage to how she believes historic figures would want their traditional agendas upheld in modern times. The traditional foundations “in Indian country” must be carefully reconciled with the realities of conducting contemporary business.

Animals. The main theme that arose in consideration of using animals in marketing tribally produced winery products was the concept of sacred versus ordinary animals. As Respondent 2 described, “most tribes’ animals are animals...They ate them, they used their bits and pieces for all types of stuff.” The use of these ordinary animals in marketing winery products was not a cause for concern with respondents, however once meaning was assigned to the animal, the issue became a denser concept to navigate. Respondent 2 addressed this point in noting that the use of sacred or ceremonial animals, such as owls, would likely be considered inappropriate. He cautioned that while “animals in general are fine...you wouldn’t want to pick calling it The Spirit Owl, certainly not tongue in cheek because you added alcohol to the wine.

You really don't want to go that way." While he spoke with levity, the cautionary message paralleled those of other respondents. Respondent 4 said:

I could see the argument both ways, and it depends on how you market it I suppose. If you're going to do clever names and work that in the artwork and be catchy, I could see that getting people's attention. On the other hand, if you're going to do sacred animals and, do we really want to put, you know, the apostles on a bottle of wine? I could see the argument both ways on that one.

The concept that these animals are as sacred to tribal members as mainstream religious figures are in dominant culture provides contextualization of the topic, as well as a point of reference for non-tribal members. For Respondent 8, the issues of using animals in marketing was one that she felt her tribe would have divided feelings toward. Currently they are experiencing an age-based disconnect in the perception of using certain symbols in nontraditional ways:

For us over here, it's a bear. And just a footprint of a bear, I know would make half of my family so angry, and the other half would say "Ah yeah, that's cool!" A lot of it is age. It's the younger generation that has, they've been out in the world a heck of a lot more. They have non-Native friends, and they have a lot more schooling and a lot more exposure to things that I think it definitely affects their decision making as far as what is appropriate and what isn't appropriate as far as... My grandma would be "No, no no no"...And the younger ones would be like "Yeah, you know, we're pretty proud of something that we're making, and this is, we're bear people. We need to have a bear on there. This is ours and we need to make our mark on it." So, it's, I don't know, I don't even know how to address that one. It would be a tribe-by-tribe thing.

In reflecting on this disconnect, she implied that the older tribal members are more traditional, and therefore more conservative with their approval. Younger tribal members, however, value bringing their heritage into modern expressions of their identity, and view sacred tribal symbols as part of their personal seal.

Respondent 9 noted that the difference in the use of animals was based both on whether the animal was sacred and what purpose the marketing served. There was no problem perceived in the use of ordinary animals for any marketing purposes, but she explained:

So in my tribe, we have Bear Clan, Deer Clan, you know, Snipe Clan, Turtle Clan. All those things, those things are sacred to me, so I wouldn't use that for marketing either. So, when there are things that are drawn up and use their emblems to support programs or made up a new program, those are the things we use. And that's to help things in our community. Where, this is using it to advertise alcohol, and I'm really against that, just because like I said, this means something to my culture, like, I'm Snipe Clan myself, and I wouldn't want to see, I wouldn't want to go buy a bottle of wine that has a snipe on it.

She notes that the use of animals in emblems to advertise tribal programs is acceptable, because it implies support of the program, as well as implied alignment with the program's values and mission. Since she did not feel tribal production of alcohol would positively impact the tribal membership, she perceived it was inappropriate to use sacred animals in their labels and marketing.

Totems. The category of totems was the only one rated as a measure of less than neutral on the acceptability scale in Hypothesis 2. In the qualitative portion, the concepts of religion and identity arose once again. While Respondents 1 and 5 felt that spiritual aspects of the tribe and marketing of tribal winery products were simply not related, Respondent 8 described this feeling in more detail:

That is in a realm that does not exist with wine. It's, it's two separate, it's almost like two separate universes. In the traditional realm for me, anyway. The traditional would deal with spirits and totems is somewhere that does not have wine. It never existed and I think those lines shouldn't be crossed.

Since wine is neither a traditional part of her tribe nor their ceremonies, she felt the totems that represented the spiritual aspect of her heritage should not be transferred into marketing such a modern endeavor. In the Venn diagram in her mind, the non-overlapping circles of "wine marketing" and "totems" are permanently separated by religious considerations. She described the feeling that it was inappropriate:

The religious aspect of it would be that there are very strict rules that go along with our ceremonies and our traditions, and it would be a pollution of those ceremonies for me to have those lines crossed, because wine was not something that we did traditionally and

it's completely new. And it wouldn't be any different than taking a cell phone into sweat for me. It's just not something that is done. That's not even the alcohol component, it's just that is something that was nontraditional, and I'm sure in the back of my brain there's the whole stigma with alcohol and Indians that doesn't help, but it is just not a traditional thing and it should not be put there.

The social etiquette that dictates proper behavior in religious contexts requires the exclusion of the modern or nontraditional. As a result, she felt that the two could not coexist, no matter how the subject was approached. Respondent 4 argued that totems are “unarguably religious symbols and as such, we don't want to demean them or take away from what they mean by using them in a way that they weren't meant to be used.” Similar to Respondent 8, he felt that it would not be true to the nature of the totems to use them for marketing purposes. Respondent 6 likened the use of totems to that of mainstream religious symbols:

Any kind of totems, that's, that's bad. Spirits, that's too personal, that would be like saying Jesus Wine. I'm not trying to be offensive, but I can see “Jesus Wine: This used to be water!” So, what would be, you know, you have to be culturally sensitive especially when it comes to religious aspects because that's where you're going to step on toes faster than anywhere else – religion.

Regardless of which religion is being considered, the theme is that their symbols are inappropriate for use in marketing – particularly of products whose consideration is value-laden, such as wine. Respondent 2 summarized the subject:

I think it would be tough to find any religious symbol from any religion that wouldn't offend a bunch of people if you used it for any marketing purposes – alcohol has all kinds of connotations good and bad, but when you start mixing religion and the business of selling alcohol, pick any religion, you're very likely going to step on some toes.

He, like the respondents quoted before, felt that it was the best practice not to integrate spiritual aspects into marketing practices. Although in general that connection would be taboo, the backlash expected from such a decision would likely be magnified by the nature of alcohol based products.

One factor contributing to this consideration was made explicit by Respondent 7's view on the issue. For him, the inappropriateness of marketing with particular symbols was tied to their role in defining his tribal identity. He explained that:

One of the things I recognize about the casinos is the Cherokee star everywhere, and I just think that's wrong. I just think that, that...And it's not because it's unholy or it's, uh, sacred. It's because our identity as a Nation is not in that casino.

Respondent 7 asserted that meaningful tribal symbols should only be associated with endeavors that are worthy of the metaphoric weight of the symbol, and in a way that honors the values represented. Similar to Respondent 8, he felt that if there was not a traditional tie to the enterprise, it should not be represented in such a way:

I think when we put those symbols on wine or the casino, that's not who we are as a Nation. And that's what we're saying, you know, that gambling is part of our heritage. So, when you put a star on there, or you put something that's heritage on there, then you say gambling is part of our Nation. And I know everyone in the world probably gambled at one time. But it's not something that was part of our Nation as a people.

When tribal businesses are associated with traditional activities, such as basket weaving, animal husbandry, or cultivation of certain crops, then it may be possible for the enterprise to be conducted with the integrity and tradition that could withstand scrutiny. However, in identifying tribal symbols with nontraditional enterprises, Respondent 7 described that:

It kinda cheapens it. It does cheapen it. And it's not because it's morally wrong to gamble, I just think it cheapens it. Cheapens the, you know, if I was going to get a tattoo, it would be awesome to get the Cherokee star tattoo. But then people's gonna see it and be like "Oh you got the casino tattoo on your arm?" Right, think about that. Aw that kinda sucks. You know if I get that tattooed on my arm everybody's going to think I'm advertising for Cherokee Casino.

Because the casino is more highly visible than education on the history and meaning of the Cherokee star, Respondent 7 felt that it had become primarily associated with the enterprise. For this reason, marketing has negative implications for the tribe's ability to preserve the knowledge

and power connected to the symbol. These findings indicate that tribes would need to proceed with caution when using tribal symbols in marketing endeavors.

Writing in a tribal language. In exploring marketing with writing in a tribal language, the themes of preservation and education, aesthetics, cultural commodification, and targeted marketing emerged. Respondent 1 felt that it would be acceptable to use a small amount of text “especially as we try to preserve the language.” Preserving the Cherokee language is a high priority to the tribe, with programs such as the Cherokee Immersion school and language classes offered to tribal members as steps toward this goal. Putting a tribal language to use in marketing extends the exposure to those outside the tribe, and it is a topic Respondent 8 considered very carefully. While she describes herself as “pretty gosh darn traditional,” she felt that:

It would have to be left up to the tribe. But, for something like telling a story on the label, I was thinking about that. Gosh, would I be really bad with telling a story on the label in a traditional language? No? Because then there’s that big education part of it that people might not be otherwise exposed to your language. And just the exposure that, like, there’s still living Indians in this country, and that we still have things like our own language is a big deal. And, yeah, we’re not just running around in loincloths and grunting, we’re into some viticulture over here.

In her estimation, the benefit would be twofold. It would expose individuals to the language and also help to combat negative and outdated stereotypes that the Native American population regularly experiences. Thus, Native languages may be a less-contentious category to market and educate with than others examined in this study. Respondent 2 described language as functional but not necessarily sacred:

I don’t know of any tribes that have any part of their written language that is special or sacred, just for communication. It’s an obvious visual tie in for the tribe, so when someone looks at it, they may recognize it as being a Native American product.

The connection is likewise noted by Respondent 7, who explained that “our language...it’s awesome, but it isn’t sacred. It [marketing] gets our language out there. Everybody wants some

cool Indian writing.” The aesthetic appeal of tribal written language is an element that can be appreciated by both tribal and non-tribal individuals. Respondent 3, a member of a California-based tribe, was enthusiastic at the idea of marketing with a written language. She exclaimed:

Oh, I think that’s super cool! Especially the Cherokee tribe has a written language, and it’s super awesome! I have a scarf written in the Cherokee language, and I think it’s beautiful. I think it’s a great idea [to market with]. Completely acceptable. 100% go!

This seemed to support Respondent 7’s assertion that “everybody wants some cool Indian writing,” and reinforced the appeal of both the tribal connection and visual elements. Respondent 6 felt that marketing with a written language could be advantageous if done tastefully, and Respondent 5 noted that “it could identify the association with the tribe and makes it relatable...especially in the area of Oklahoma where I grew up.” This could contribute to the local appeal that was identified as a theme in the Geography section of this study.

Respondent 4 did not find it necessary to market with a tribal language, because he felt it was incongruous with what the tribe was attempting to accomplish:

Are we selling wine because this is good wine, or are we selling wine because this is Native American-made wine. I feel like if we are selling this wine in an area that is predominantly speaking a native language, we need to write that on the label so that that’s easily communicable, then I applaud that and I think it’s a great idea. Otherwise I think we’re sort of trading on our culture.

His assertion was that marketing with a tribal language to those who cannot understand it would commodify a piece of tribal heritage. In essence, they would be purchasing the piece of language along with the winery product, and he does not feel that is something a tribe should be willing to sell.

Respondent 4’s point that it could make the product accessible to tribal populations whose primary method of communication is a tribal language was positive in his assessment, but was addressed as a potential negative by Respondents 9 and 10. Respondent 9 questioned

whether the intention would be to “describe it, or...to market to tribal members? [If the intention is to market] then that’s unethical right there.” Similarly, Respondent 10 noted that “mostly I have no problem with it, but I know a lot of tribal members would see that as marketing to their tribe as the ones who would be able to read it.” The decision of which words to use and how to present the language are integral in considering whether marketing with a written tribal language would be perceived as acceptable to tribal members.

Meaningful tribal objects. The primary considerations identified in this category were stereotyping and whether the object was sacred or ordinary. Respondents 3 and 4 cautioned against marketing with objects in this category. Respondent 3 felt that they would not contribute to the development of an interesting brand, because “those are things that are commonly stereotyped to represent Native Americans.” Reinforcing the stereotypes from which Native Americans work to break free would, then, be a disservice to the tribe and unacceptable as a result. Respondent 4 echoed this sentiment:

Well, I think it’s a bad marketing choice, ultimately speaking. But all those fall under the category of some of the previous ones. What are we selling? And do we want to become the Irish Pub of winemaking? Do we want to become that German guy in lederhosen you see when you go to Germany? I think a lot of traditional culture and cultural activities - they get drowned for the tourists. And ultimately, I think that those traditions are alive to a certain degree because of that, but it’s sort of an undead sort of alive because they’re not really being practiced. They’re being put on a stage for people to draw tips from, and I don’t think we should do that to ourselves if we don’t have to.

He offers a powerful description of the possible ramifications of marketing with culturally-based material. Though this is in response to prompting in the category of Meaningful Tribal Objects, he applied it to each of the Native American-specific topics throughout the discussion and believed a tribally operated winery would do better to operate as a vintner first and foremost. The concept that marketing can reinforce stereotypes is also addressed by Respondent 8:

I think that goes along with the same thing. I just had a friend and I've known him since, gosh, I don't know when. Probably 12 years old. And he, not long ago, was looking through my pictures on Facebook and he said he had no idea that we had cedar bark houses. He said "You have cedar teepees?" And I said, "Those are not teepees." And he was like, "How did I not know this?" [And I said] "I don't know...I run across it all the time, Dave, and I can't believe you're one of them."

It was surprising to her that knowledge of her culture was still lacking in individuals who were close to her. In her case, representing a tribal product with a cedar bark house may be advantageous because it would educate non-tribal members on some common items that are unique to their membership. She discussed that in choosing which meaningful objects would be acceptable, it should not something that would be included in ceremony:

Some images would be okay, but other images I think would not. If it's something really personal and something that is used in ceremony, that's one thing. But like the bark house, I think a bark house would be fine. Just because it's a symbol of us and where we come from. And when you see a cedar bark house in California, you automatically have certain tribes that are affiliated with it.

Objects of a religious nature are once again precluded from consideration for marketing purposes, which is supported by the discussion in the Totems portion of this study. Respondent 2 agreed in his assessment of what would be appropriate for marketing in this category. He felt that ordinary objects could be great signifiers, but religious connections would result in objections from tribal members:

If those items had special significance outside of just being part of the tribe, but if there's a religious tone to them, like some people object to dream catchers, some tribes don't actually care because they weren't particularly religious to them. You did it for its purpose but it wasn't, it just had a function of catching dreams, so depending on what you think people believe about those objects or symbols. Teepees, as far as I know those were just houses, so it's like putting a picture of a house on the bottle. Sure, go for it! But if you chose symbols and things decorating that teepee that make it out to be the tribe's priest or medicine man's teepee, then people might object. The number of people who might notice could be small but that could, in today's internet world, people could look it up and say "hey that symbol's supposed to be...and look what they did!"

Respondent 2 extended his consideration to include both items that have a religious function and symbols that could change the categorization of a particular object. The internet provides ready access to information, and he believed this could result in discovery of even the subtlest faux pas, with very negative results for the company who made the mistake.

Research Question 3

RQ3. How do non-involved Native American participants perceive the future of tribal winery operations?

Research Question 3 was addressed through statistical analysis of Hypothesis 5, and qualitative exploration of the perceived future in the categories of potential negatives, wine and the market, tribal considerations, and educational outreach.

Hypothesis 5

There will exist an inverse relationship between perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perceived viability of tribal winery operations.

Statistical analysis of Hypothesis 5 was conducted in four parts. 5A and 5B examines the relationship between average perceived benefit and barrier scores with perceived viability of the respondents' own tribe:

- A. A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for MY tribe and average perceived barriers.
- B. A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for MY tribe and average perceived benefits.

The next part, 5C and 5D, examines the relationship between average perceived barrier and benefit scores with perceived viability of a winery business is another tribe:

- C. A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for tribes OTHER

than my own and average perceived barriers.

- D. A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for tribes OTHER than my own and average perceived benefits.

For Hypothesis 5A, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for their OWN tribe and their average perceived barrier score. The independent variable of OWN viability was assessed at five levels in response to the following question, "A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for MY tribe." The dependent variable was the average perceived barrier score. The five levels assessed were Strongly Agree ($M = 2.54$, $SD = .97$), Agree ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .78$), Unsure/Mixed ($M = 2.98$, $SD = .42$), Disagree ($M = 3.19$, $SD = .55$), and Strongly Disagree ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .72$). The ANOVA suggested that there were significant differences between participants' perceived viability for their OWN tribe and their average perceived barrier scores $F(4, 126) = 4.805$, $p = .001$. The strength of the relationship between the two variables, as assessed by eta squared, was strong with perceived viability accounting for 13.2% of the variance on the dependent variable.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate differences among the means. Because the Levene's test was significant $F(4, 126) = 7.98$, $p < .001$, we assume that the variances are heterogeneous and conducted post hoc comparisons using Dunnett T3 due to the unequal sample sizes. There were significant differences between strongly agree and strongly disagree ($p = .026$). However, there were no significant differences across any other pairwise comparisons. The 95% confidence intervals pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the 5 viability groups are reported in Table 31. The results suggest those who Strongly Agree that a

tribally operated winery is a viable business enterprise for their tribe have a significantly lower perception of barriers to entry than do those who Strongly Disagree that a winery would be a viable business opportunity.

Table 31

Barrier Score by MY Tribe's Viability

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	95% Confidence Interval			
				Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure/Mixed	Disagree
Strongly Agree	27	2.54	.97				
Agree	51	2.79	.78	[-.374, .890]			
Unsure/ Mixed	38	2.98	.42	[-.151, 1.030]	[-.187, .550]		
Disagree	8	3.19	.55	[-.175, 1.49]	[-.345, 1.141]	[-.516, .950]	
Strongly Disagree	7	3.73	.72	[-.120, 2.33]	[-.112, 2.04]	[-.301, 1.87]	[-.571, 1.70]

Note: An asterisk indicated that the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero and therefore the difference in means is significant at the .05 level using Dunnett T3 procedure.

For Hypothesis 5B, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for their OWN tribe and their average perceived benefit score. The independent variable of OWN viability was assessed at five levels in response to the following the question, "A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for MY tribe." The dependent variable was the average perceived benefit score. The five levels assessed were Strongly Agree ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .65$), Agree ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .74$), Unsure/Mixed ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .85$), Disagree ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.03$), and Strongly Disagree ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.13$). The ANOVA was significant $F(4, 126) = 8.812$, $p < .001$. The strength of the relationship between the two variables, as assessed by eta squared, was strong with perceived viability accounting for 21.9% of the variance on the dependent variable.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate differences among the means. Because Levene's test was not significant $F(4, 126) = 1.043$, $p = .388$, variances are assumed to be homogenous and post hoc comparisons were conducted using Tukey-Kramer due to the unequal sample sizes. The differences in average perceived benefit scores were significantly different between Strongly Agree and Agree ($p = .003$), Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed ($p < .001$), Strongly Agree and Disagree ($p = .007$), and Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree ($p < .001$). As respondents felt more positively about the viability of a winery operation in their tribe, their average perception of the benefits of winery operation increased significantly. Mean ratings for perceived viability and average perception of benefits increased with each level from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Table 31

Benefit Score by MY Tribe's Viability

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	95% Confidence Interval			
				Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure/Mixed	Disagree
Strongly Agree	27	4.16	.65				
Agree	51	3.45	.74	[-1.09, -.33]*			
Unsure/ Mixed	38	3.13	.85	[-1.43, -.63]*	[-.66, .02]		
Disagree	8	3.05	1.03	[-1.75, -.47]*	[-1.00, .20]	[-.70, .54]	
Strongly Disagree	7	2.71	1.13	[-2.12, -.77]*	[-1.37, -.09]	[-1.07, .24]	[-1.16, .48]

Note: An asterisk indicated that the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero and therefore the difference in means is significant at the .05 level using Tukey-Kramer procedure.

For Hypothesis 5C, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability of a winery operation for OTHER tribes and their average perceived barrier score. The independent variable of OTHER viability was assessed at five levels in response to the following question, "A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunities for tribes OTHER than my own." The five levels assessed were Strongly Agree ($M = 2.57, SD = 1.02$), Agree ($M = 2.79, SD = .74$), Unsure/Mixed ($M = 3.04, SD = .55$), Disagree ($N = 0$), and Strongly Disagree ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.08$). The dependent variable was the average perceived barrier score.

The ANOVA suggested that there were significant differences between participants' perceived viability of a winery operation for tribes OTHER than their own and their average perceived barrier scores $F(3, 127) = 2.962, p = .035$. The strength of the relationship between the two variables, as assessed by eta squared, was moderate with perceived viability accounting for 6.5% of the variance on the dependent variable. Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate differences among the means. Because the Levene's test was significant $F(3, 127) = 6.88, p < .001$, we assume that the variances are heterogeneous and conducted post hoc comparisons using Dunnett T3 due to the unequal sample sizes; however, there were no significant differences across any pairwise comparisons. While the model was found to be significant, heterogeneous variances lead to the possibility that the F statistic is biased by the mixing of large and small sample groups. As a result, the significance of the model can be underestimated, causing a significant result when no differences actually exist.

Table 32

Barrier Score by Viability for OTHER Tribes

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	95% Confidence Interval			
				Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure/Mixed	Disagree
Strongly Agree	24	2.57	1.02				
Agree	50	2.79	.74	[-.146, .590]			
Unsure/ Mixed	52	3.04	.55	[.111, .843]*	[-.039, .548]		
Disagree	0	--	--	--	--	--	
Strongly Disagree	5	3.29	1.08	[-1.195, .195]	[-.195, 1.195]	[-.449, .939]	--

Note: An asterisk indicated that the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero and therefore the difference in means is significant at the .05 level using Dunnett T3 procedure.

For Hypothesis 5D, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for OTHER tribes and their average perceived benefit score. The independent variable of OTHER viability was assessed at five levels in response to the following question, "A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunities for tribes OTHER than my own." The dependent variable was the average perceived benefit score. The five levels assessed were Strongly Agree ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .68$), Agree ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .76$), Unsure/Mixed ($M = 3.14$, $SD = .86$), Disagree ($N = 0$), and Strongly Disagree ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.51$).

The ANOVA suggested that there were significant differences between participants' perceived viability tribes OTHER than their own and their average perceived benefit scores $F(3, 127) = 8.87$, $p = .000$. The strength of the relationship between the two variables, as assessed by eta squared, was strong with perceived viability accounting for 17.3% of the variance on the dependent variable. Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate differences among the means. Because the Levene's test was significant $F(3, 127) = 2.72$, $p = .047$, we assume that the variances are heterogeneous and conducted post hoc comparisons using Dunnett T3 due to the unequal sample sizes. There were significant differences between Strongly Agree and Agree ($p = .001$) and Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed ($p < .001$). However, there were no significant differences across any other pairwise comparisons. The 95% confidence intervals pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the 5 viability groups are reported in Table 33. As respondents felt more positively about the viability of a winery operation for other tribes, their average perception of the benefits of winery operation increased. This increase was significant between the categories of Strongly Agree and Agree, and Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed.

Table 33

Benefit Score by Viability for OTHER Tribes

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	95% Confidence Interval			
				Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure/Mixed	Disagree
Strongly Agree	24	4.12	.68				
Agree	50	3.43	.76	[-1.21, -.26]*			
Unsure/Mixed	52	3.14	.86	[-1.52, -.53]*	[-.72, .14]		
Disagree	0	--	--	--	--	--	
Strongly Disagree	5	3.08	1.51	[-3.98, 1.80]	[-3.27, 2.56]	[-2.97, 2.84]	--

Note: An asterisk indicated that the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero and therefore the difference in means is significant at the .05 level using Dunnett T3 procedure.

Research Question 3: Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis of the perceived future of Native-owned wineries is divided into the categories of potential negatives, wine and the market, and tribal considerations. Each of these categories is discussed in detail.

Potential negatives. In discussing the future of tribally owned winery operations, tribe members' personal and tribal histories contributed to fears of a potential negative outcome. Respondents 1 and 9 noted the history of substance abuse within tribal populations, and worried that it would contribute to similar patterns of behavior in the future. Respondent 1 was concerned with the effect that alcohol would have on her tribe's reputation, given her association with it in health-related circumstances, and explained that "any alcohol would be unfavorable to a positive image of the tribe to their people. Around here it's probably a no." While she did acknowledge that tribal hospitality enterprises currently serve alcohol, she felt that further association with an alcohol-based product would not be favorably received within her tribe and was not a viable business operation because of the potential consequences. Respondent 9 had similar experiences in her tribe, and did not believe the cost-benefit analysis involving potential profits at the cost of public health was a future in which to invest:

Especially with our already statistics, and then what if that turned into, it raises the statistics of alcoholism, of violence and abuse, then it just helps the everlasting circle that's already going on in our reservation, in our communities, and you know we're the highest number of alcoholism, we're the highest number of incarcerated, we're the highest number of suicides, and it's just going to contribute to that. It would go backwards, you know, but I want that number to come down.

For her, tribally owned wineries would contribute to systemic problems within their at-risk population. The consideration of public health is a foundational issue that will require careful attention by decision makers in all stages of planning.

Respondent 3 was unique in the qualitative sample, as she described her people

historically being used as slaves in the planting and operation of early west coast wineries. She reported that, “I don’t think there’s a sense of future there for us, and I really hope it does not happen for us.” The sense of gravity with which Respondent 3 considered the future of tribally owned wineries was anchored in a desire for other tribes to maintain their ability to choose the best path for their membership.

Respondent 7 had personal experience with the process through which tribes consider and implement new business ventures. He described the controversy surrounding the beginning of casino operation in his tribe, and said that he “really thought when they brought gambling into our Nation, that would be a deal breaker, but it wasn’t.” He compared the morally contentious nature of gambling with the path he imaged Native-owned wineries would follow:

This was because it was like, education, so just like this winery, there was still really weighing you know, if we do this our education program is going to, in Oklahoma, have all this positive media. But people also, because they had different morals or were raised more Bible Belt-ish, or what you could say were different Christian values, they were like “No, no. Gambling is, it’s a sin and it’s going to cause people to be in debt and it’s going to cause addiction.”

In considering casino operations, he described people mitigating the negative considerations with rallying cries that the profits would fund education and support the state’s future. He imaged that deliberation over tribal winery operation would be more difficult based on the tribe’s experience with casino operation:

So now we realize that we have casinos everywhere and Oklahoma schools are in worse shape than they’ve ever been, so I think whenever we look at this as a Nation, that’ll be that way too. People will be like “Oh, that’s what they said about gambling, that oh we’ll have more money for our Nation,” but we have a hard time getting eyeglasses and people are still having a hard time getting certain stuff paid for, and we have a problem with poverty in our Nation, and so you know, they don’t see the money actually coming back. So, I think that would be, that’s a real challenge to bring something up that you have a moral dilemma on say, “Hey, but it’s going to be great for our tribe and more money. Since they’ve had that experience, they’re gonna be a little more hesitant, because they’ve done that with the gambling, and people are gonna be like “oh man, it’s going to

be such an influx of money in our Nation because they're going to put these big casinos in Tulsa and here in Siloam Springs" and we haven't seen that.

The experience of expecting a (likely unrealistic) amount of support from a controversial enterprise could result in bias in consideration of a tribally operated winery in the future. While the casino does bring money into the Cherokee Nation, the perception that casino operation would be a quick-fix set up unreasonable expectations for some tribe members.

People didn't understand how much it costs to run a casino. They just thought "millions of dollars are going to flood into our economy," but it's expensive. You've got to spend millions to make millions, you know what I'm saying. So, I think that's the way the wine thing will be too. They're going to be like, "Oh the Cherokee Nation is going to invest in all this land and build these vineyards and give us jobs." But I think we've had a taste of that before, and it's going to be hard for some old-fashioned type people, you know what I'm saying.

Respondent 7 explained that winery operation has a longer incubation period than casinos for profits to become available for tribal programs. The history he describes provides context to members' potential opinions in the future and serves as a cautionary framework for addressing the educational needs of the membership. Understanding realistic projections and communicating those to key stakeholders is an important part of avoiding a similar experience in consideration of future enterprises.

Wine and the market. Respondent 6 and 7 projected that it would take their tribe years and years to develop a viable winery operation. Respondent 6 felt that, as the tribe gained more experience through trial and error, "I think over a 10-year period they would go from being a new name in the business to being very, very prominent in the business." Using her tribe's resources, she felt there would be an eventual, large return. Respondent 6's consideration of the future of wineries was tempered by the possibility of risk during the waiting. He described that, "To have a real good vineyard takes years and years of sitting back and watching it grow, and I think that's tough. I think it's tough, because, like you know, what happens if drought and

disease? It just brings a lot of doubt to people that are used to easy investments and easy returns.” In this, he is describing the “instant gratification” mindset that Respondent 8 identified in her younger tribal population. The time-investment and element of risk that are part of developing the business directly affect his perception of the idea’s viability.

Respondent 2 sensibly projected that tribally operated wineries would “pretty much be tied to what winery business looked like in the rest of the region.” In the case of Respondent 4, that would be perceived as positive, given that he described tribal winery operation as a “potentially untapped market, particularly in the part of the country I live.” The room for growth was identified by interviewees from both coastal tribes, as Respondent 8 described, “living here, there are wineries going in everywhere in California... You can do it in a nontraditional way, so to speak, and you can do it better.” Her perception was that a tribally operated winery that could fill a “niche” would operate successfully based on the examples of Native-owned operations in the state, particularly if that operation took advantage of other tribal mentors in the industry.

Finally, Respondents 7 and 8 considered the future of the tribal winery operations from the consumer standpoint. Respondent 8 felt that short of “total economic collapse,” wine would be a safe product to market. She noted that, “wine and alcohol has always been a big thing, and despite the fact that we have problems with it, it’s going to be something that’s looked at as economic development, because it’s a sustainable product. It’s a consumable.” Choosing to work with a product that has a sustained demand and industry growth indicated to Respondent 8 that tribal enterprises would be wise to consider this direction. Respondent 7 spoke about the changes that he has witnessed in his rural area of Oklahoma throughout the years. Those who were not traditional “wine drinkers” have started to partake, and he noted that alcohol can be seen in grocery stores now, which was not historically the case:

Used to...everyone was drinking a cold beer, but now it's like more metropolitan in rural areas. People are drinking wine with their dinners instead of having a cold beer or koolaid or just tea. People are just getting together and smoking expensive cigars on their back porch and drinking a glass of expensive wine in Oklahoma. Nowadays...people are like connoisseurs of wine in places and in people you wouldn't have thought – people that are just blue collar people that are 9 to 5 living paycheck to paycheck. When they go out, they want a nice glass of wine. Or when they have family over for Christmas, they buy a nice bottle of wine, which usually that was more metropolitan or urban type, but now it's like country people are getting the finer things in life.

His perception was that the wine market has expanded into nontraditional areas, which means there are an increased number of opportunities for sales and industry growth. He believed it would be a marketable product, especially since “people are more local buyers now.” Both respondents felt that the future of tribally operated wineries would be strong based on the current market and examples of growth and success.

Tribal Considerations. Members primarily discussed the benefits that could result from tribal winery operation in their conception of the future. Respondent 4 felt that it was “the kind of thing that could really do well and therefore bring income into the tribe and...benefit its members;” however, he felt that strategic planning was an important component in bringing that prediction to fruition. Part of that planning process that will be key to success in Respondent 8's estimation is mentoring activities and resources:

I think definitely it's going to be a bigger thing as long as there are a few success stories out there, and tribes have access to land and funding out there to get this off the ground, and, just for us, ourselves, we're so close to places like Napa and all along the Sonoma Hills that there's plenty of mentoring and plenty of examples, and people who are willing to help.

Her belief that the concept will grow as more positive examples present themselves would also indicate that more seasoned professionals would be available to form mentoring partnerships.

Though the choice to mentor would be made operation-by-operation, the potential exists.

Respondent 5 felt that a winery was a viable idea for her tribe. She hoped that decision makers would “at least take advantage of exploring the idea,” because she felt positively toward the idea of “empowering people with a skill set or a trade, impacting economic growth. That’s kind of how I imagine it in my mind.” From her experience, Respondent 6 agreed that economic growth and jobs would result from tribal winery operation. She had “seen enough to know that whenever a tribe gets involved in a business, they usually can make a very successful go of it.” She saw no reason that tribal winery operation should differ from her previous experiences with other business enterprises in her tribe. She cautiously extended that consideration to smaller tribes as well, but felt that tribes with larger memberships and a greater amount of resources to begin with would fare more successfully in this area. She explained:

Anything that could be seen as a constraint to the whole process from the beginning to the end, I think there’s ways around it, unless the tribe was so small that they couldn’t, and they had no land and no casino to use their own wine in as much. I can’t see that being as fiscally responsible as it would be for a big tribe like mine that would just grow from it.

It makes sense for tribes to make determinations individually based on their specific mix of factors, and the viability of any enterprise will depend on the requirements of the operation (such as, in the case of wineries, access to land, workforce, and financial resources), the specific needs of the tribe, and their location within the market.

Finally, the needs of education and outreach were identified in perceptions of the future of tribally operated wineries. Respondent 6 felt that Native Americans entering the wine industry had “an easy chance of overcoming” the identified barrier of social resistance. She considered that it is “just a matter of educating your people. And Cherokee Nation being the tribe that I’m from – I know for a fact that they are fantastic at educating their people.”

Acknowledging that the barrier is likely to exist in the early stages of strategizing allows the tribe to consider the best method of addressing it. While Respondent 6 primarily considered a need for education within the tribe to mitigate social resistance, Respondent 8 felt that education was needed to address the incorrect beliefs of individuals outside of the tribe. She described that, in her area, people reacted to Native American individuals in two ways. As discussed previously, some people refused to believe that modern Native Americans existed. Others, described by Respondent 8, acknowledged Native American heritage as secondary to mainstream society, and therefore not worthy of resource control:

They don't see that Indians should have a casino. That the people who are claiming to be Indian now, it's like the Donald Trump interview, "They don't look Indian to me." The whole atmosphere has really put Native Americans in the forefront, and they're in the traditional agriculture areas. People are seeing the casinos and Native Americans as job killers like the Mexicans. And I'm like, nobody is doing these jobs! The last few years when the migrant farm workers have moved out of places, nobody will save those farms. And it's the same mindset with the casinos...there's a lot of education that needs to go there.

The first issue addressed here, that of mixed race Native Americans, speaks to the need to educate and inform public perception of Native individuals in the modern era. Like the stereotype of alcoholism in Native populations, this stereotype also reduces individuals to only their component parts, and it places value or legitimacy solely on those that can be visually or overtly confirmed. Secondly, education is identified as necessary to overcome the perception that the role of Native-owned enterprises negatively affects mainstream culture in any way. This could be improved through outreach with a specific, targeted message to demonstrate the reality of Native operations' market position.

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation. A modified, mixed-methods exploratory sequential approach was used to explore issues of business diversification, marketing, perceived barriers to success, perceived benefits to the tribe, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of tribal heritage. *Phase 1* quantitative data was collected via an online survey through Qualtrics and analyzed using SPSS through one-way ANOVA, *t*-tests, and correlations to evaluate the interactions between the variables. Respondents to the survey instrument were given the option to volunteer for a follow-up interview. Selective sampling of those who volunteered was used to choose ten interviewees for the next phase. Qualitative interviews were conducted in *Phase 2*, and the transcripts were analyzed through open, axial, and selective coding to saturate the research categories. Data from both phases of research was organized to address the research questions in Chapter 4. Results indicated that education and careful strategic planning will be integral to tribes as they consider this diversification option.

The designation of “non-involved” was created to provide clarity to the research questions. Non-involved individuals are members of federally recognized tribes who do not currently have a role in the wine industry. The specific research questions used in this study, which served as the framework for both quantitative and qualitative analyses, were:

1. What are non-involved tribal participants’ current perceptions of tribally owned winery operations?
2. What are the perceptions of non-involved Native American individuals toward the use of Native American icons or symbols on tribally owned winery products for

marketing purposes?

3. How do non-involved Native American participants perceive the future of tribal winery operations?

In addressing the quantitative portion of these research questions, hypotheses were used to provide a framework for statistical analysis. In addressing Hypothesis 6, sample sizes for Pantraditional ($n=1$), Traditional ($n=0$), and Marginal ($n=4$) were so small that conducting inferential statistical analyses was not reasonable. For this reason, Hypothesis 6 was modified to facilitate analysis. The hypotheses for this study read as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perceptions of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perception of benefits of entry in non-involved participants.

Hypothesis 2:

Non-involved participants will rate acceptability of using Native American symbols and icons in marketing tribally produced wine products on a Likert scale as a measure of less than neutral.

Hypothesis 3:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

E. Women will rate overall perceived barriers as higher than men.

F. Overall perceived barriers will be parallel to participants' age.

G. Participants with lower education will have a higher perception of overall barriers.

H. Higher income will be related to a lower overall perception of barriers.

Hypothesis 4:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived benefits to entry into the wine industry based on demographic characteristics.

E. Men will rate overall perceived benefits higher than women.

F. Overall perceived benefits will be inversely related to participants' age.

G. Participants with higher education will have a higher perception of overall benefits.

H. Higher income will be related to a higher overall perception of benefits.

Hypothesis 5:

There will exist an inverse relationship between perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry and perceived viability of tribal winery operations.

Hypothesis 6:

Non-involved participants will demonstrate differences in perceived barriers and benefits to entry into the wine industry based on their level of acculturation.

C. A statistically significant difference will exist in the perceived barrier scores of respondents with an acculturation score of "Bicultural" and those with an acculturation score of "Assimilated."

D. A statistically significant difference will exist in the perceived benefit scores of respondents with an acculturation score of "Bicultural" and those with an acculturation score of "Assimilated."

Discussion

Current Perceptions

For Research Question 1, quantitative analyses of the survey data to address Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 3, Hypothesis 4, and Hypothesis 6 were conducted, and interview transcripts were analyzed and coded in the categories of business diversification, perceived benefits of tribal winery operation, perceived barriers of tribal winery operation, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of heritage. Each section addressing Research Question 1 speaks to non-involved tribal members' current perceptions of tribally owned wineries.

Hypothesis 1. The mean average perceived barrier score ($M = 2.87$) and the mean average perceived benefit score ($M = 3.45$) were within one standard deviation of each other. While overall respondents had a higher perception of the benefits of winery operation than the barriers, the difference was not large. Correlations with average barrier score and average benefit score were conducted based on demographic characteristics of age, education, gender, and income. A small strength correlation was found between income and barrier, with a higher income translating to a lower perception of barriers to entry into the wine industry.

In investigating Hypothesis 1, the data did not support a conclusion that an inverse relationship exists between the perception of barriers to tribal entry into the wine industry and the perception of the benefits that tribal winery operation could provide. These findings could be due to the small sample size, and call for further investigation into this area.

Hypothesis 3. A t -test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationships between each of the variables in the sub-hypotheses and the average perceived barrier scores. The independent variables used were gender, age, education, and income. The dependent variable was the average perception of barriers score. An independent sample t -test for

Hypothesis 3A found no statistically significant difference in gender and average perceived barrier score, although women ($M = 2.93$) did have a higher perceived barrier score than men ($M = 2.67$). For Hypothesis 3B, an independent sample t -test found no statistically significant difference in age and average perceived barrier score, but younger respondents ($M = 2.92$) actually had a higher perception than older respondents ($M = 2.83$). For Hypothesis 3C, a one-way ANOVA evaluated the relationship between respondents' education level and average perceived barrier score. The results were not significant, although the mean perceived barrier score did decrease incrementally as education level increased. Hypothesis 3D was evaluated through one-way ANOVA to determine whether a relationship exists between respondents' income level and average perceived barrier score. Significant differences were found between the income level of \$19,999 or less and \$50,001 - \$75,000 ($p = .049$), with those having a lower income having a higher average perception of barriers.

In investigating Hypothesis 3, the demographic differences in perception of barriers did not show as many significant differences as expected. This could be due to the uneven representation across the demographic characteristics and a relatively small sample size per category. The finding that a significant difference existed between the income levels of \$19,999 or less and \$50,001 - \$75,000 reflects in small part the expectation that a higher income would translate to a lower perception of barriers.

Hypothesis 4. A t -test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationships between each of the variables in the sub-hypotheses and the average perceived benefit scores. The independent variables used were gender, age, education, and income. The dependent variable was the average perception of benefit score. An independent sample t -test for Hypothesis 4A found no statistically significant difference in gender and average perceived

benefit score. For Hypothesis 4B, an independent sample *t*-test found no statistically significant difference in age and average perceived benefit score, but younger respondents ($M = 3.50$) had a higher perception of benefits than older respondents ($M = 3.41$). For Hypothesis 4C, a one-way ANOVA evaluated the relationship between respondents' education level and average perceived benefits score. The results were not significant. Hypothesis 4D was evaluated through one-way ANOVA to determine whether a relationship exists between respondents' income level and average perceived benefits score, but results were not significant.

In investigating Hypothesis 4, the demographic differences in perception of benefits did not show as significant differences. This is contrary to what was expected, and could be due to the uneven representation across the demographic characteristics and a relatively sample size per category.

Hypothesis 6. For Hypothesis 6A, statistical analyses of the differences in barrier scores for Bicultural and Assimilated participants was conducted. A Welch *t*-test was used because it is robust against unequal variances and sample sizes, and the results indicated that Bicultural respondents perceived barriers to entry into the wine industry as significantly higher than Assimilated respondents. For Hypothesis 6B, statistical analyses of the differences in benefit scores for Bicultural and Assimilated participants was conducted. An independent sample *t*-test indicated that Bicultural and Assimilated individuals did not differ significantly in their perception of the benefits of tribal winery operation.

In evaluating Hypothesis 6, the significance found in part 6A meets the expectations of the researcher. This could be for two reasons. Bicultural members could have a higher integration into their tribe, and therefore have a deeper understanding of what could be successful in their specific tribe based on their values or resources. This could also be because

they are less a part of mainstream culture, and therefore have less experience with wine or winery operation and its general acceptance.

Qualitative Analysis. Coding and analysis of participants' current perceptions of tribally owned winery operations in the interview transcripts revealed the categories of business diversification, perceived benefits of tribal winery operation, perceived barriers of tribal winery operation, and the role of agriculture in the preservation of heritage. Themes emerging within each of these categories were discussed in detail with illustrative examples from the interview transcripts.

Within the category of business diversification, respondents discussed supporting other existing tribal businesses through winery operation, applying existing tribal resources to the enterprise, land issues, matters of state and the US wine market, being new/novel, ties to heritage, and the potentially divisive nature of alcohol-based businesses. Perceived benefits of tribal winery operation identified were increased revenue for programs, keeping the community close, employment opportunities, and establishing the presence of Native American individuals in the modern era. The primary barriers to success cited by respondents were social resistance and the negative stereotype associated with Native Americans and alcohol, although issues of resources, delayed gratification, and authenticity were identified as secondary concerns. Preservation of heritage and the role of agriculture were common themes in discussion with the California-based respondents, with the concepts of tribal history, preservation of heritage through agriculture, and economic development versus the preservation of land arising in their considerations.

Marketing Tribal Winery Products

Research Question 2 was addressed through statistical analysis of Hypothesis 2, and qualitative exploration of the marketing categories of geography, ceremonial dress, historic figures, animals, totems, writing in a tribal language, and meaningful objects. Each portion of this section speaks to the level of acceptableness perceived by non-involved Native American respondents on the use of their cultural symbols and icons in marketing.

Hypothesis 2. Responses based on a Likert scale (1 = completely acceptable, 2 = somewhat unacceptable, 3 = neither acceptable nor unacceptable, 4 = somewhat acceptable, and 5 = completely acceptable) were averaged for each of seven categories. The marketing categories used were geography, ceremonial dress, Native American historic figures, animals, totems, writing in a tribal language, and meaningful tribal objects. Geography ($M = 3.92$), animals ($M = 3.87$), and tribal writing ($M = 3.73$) scoring the highest on the acceptability scale, indicating that these categories would be least controversial for use in marketing in general. Meaningful tribal objects fell in the middle of the score range ($M = 3.48$), indicating that it is possible for these to be used in an acceptable way for marketing. Ceremonial dress ($M = 3.15$) and Native American historic figures ($M = 3.01$) each scored neutrally on the scale. The final category was the only one that scored as a measure of less than neutral. The category of totems ($M = 2.83$) was largely regarded as unacceptable for marketing by the survey respondents, indicating that marketing materials pulled from this category would likely encounter resistance in the Native American population, as well as among others.

Hypothesis 2 provides a framework for consideration of marketing materials for tribal wine products. In general, the safest categories for marketing consideration are geography, animals, and tribal writing. Categories of ceremonial dress and historic figures were rated as

neutral, and the category of totem was rated as more unacceptable than acceptable. These results were generally higher than expected, and this may be as a result of tribal members hesitating to speak on behalf of all tribes with their opinions of unacceptability or imagining a specific scenario in their tribe or another where the marketing category *could* work.

Qualitative analysis. Qualitative analysis revealed themes and considerations for each of the marketing categories. For geography, respondents spoke on the topics of shopping local, connection to nature, area reputation, and possible negative considerations. The “shop local” movement was seen as an avenue that geographical advertising could take advantage of, as it could communicate to consumers that they were supporting the local economy and residents. Native Americans’ collective connection to nature was another possible tie in with geographical advertising, and it made sense to tribal members in or near established AVAs to take advantage the existing reputation in marketing their products. The potential negative considerations for marketing with geography were tied to the history of the land, such as whether the land was associated with “any number of injustices” historically suffered by tribe members.

Ceremonial dress was considered in the context of religion, cultural appropriation, and commodification of culture. When items of ceremonial dress are used in religious contexts, such as ceremonies or by ranking members, it was perceived as sacrilegious to use them in marketing wine products. While ceremonial dress generally seen in mainstream marketing constitutes cultural appropriation in the opinion of respondents, they felt that each tribe would know how to market their products in a way that was “culturally sensitive” and upheld the integrity of their heritage. Others felt that it was inappropriate to market with ceremonial dress in any way, as it commodified a piece of tribal heritage.

Marketing with Native American historic figures was addressed by respondents in terms

of the historic figures' traditional values, honoring their memory, and permission to use their likeness. If the marketing agenda was either unrelated or in direct opposition to the figure's traditional agenda, it was seen as unfavorable for use in marketing a wine product. While respondents acknowledged that we use historic figures' likenesses on coins or other items, the distinction exists that this is to honor their memory and not for financial gain. Finally, it was cautioned that permission from descendants would likely be important and necessary for using any individual's likeness in marketing.

Animals used in marketing were considered to be acceptable if they were simply ordinary animals, but a distinction was made between those and animals that are sacred to the tribe. Sacred animals can be ceremonial, and therefore inappropriate for marketing in the same way that religious figures are, or can be symbolic of clans or other factions within the tribe. Marketing using animals that represent sectors of the tribe is considered as effectively tying those members' identity to the product, and this is controversial in an alcohol-based endeavor. An age-based divide was found on this subject, with older, more traditional members feeling that the two should be completely separate, and the younger, more contemporary members feeling that advertising with their animal to be a way to apply a personal seal to their product and exhibit pride and approval thereof.

Totems were considered unacceptable for marketing because of their religious nature and the role they play in defining Native individuals' identity. Similar to the consideration of ceremonial dress as sacrilegious if used in marketing, totems were considered meaningful traditional parts of a tribe that should not mix with modern economic pursuits. Using these in marketing was considered taboo, and would likely result in backlash from tribal members. In relation to identity, totems were not appropriate to use in marketing unless the item being

marketing was of high integrity and deeply significant to the identity of the tribe. In essence, placing an image of a totem on a product identifies that product as being part of the identity of the tribe it represents. Since alcohol is a turbulent subject to navigate in tribal populations, syncing their identity with an alcohol-based product did not make sense to interviewees.

In considering marketing with writing in a tribal language, preservation and education, aesthetics, cultural commodification, and targeting marketing emerged as important concepts. Exposing the public to a tribal language was seen as a method through which education on modern Native Americans' rich culture could be shared to demonstrate that "we have modern and future projections" rather than simply being a part of the past. It also was seen as a method to aid in preservation of the language, and a way to create an aesthetically pleasing label. The concept that using writing in a tribal language in marketing was commodifying part of Native culture arose as a potential negative, and some respondents mentioned it could be seen as targeted marketing to more traditional tribal members who do not use English as their primary language.

Finally, the category of meaningful tribal objects was discussed in terms of whether the object was sacred or ordinary and whether it would contribute to mainstream stereotyping. Tribal objects that simply served a given purpose were considered acceptable, while those related to ceremony were not. Respondents felt that using items that are commonly associated with Native Americans would contribute to stereotyping, and one respondent cautioned that using these stereotyped items would not constitute an interesting brand because of their overuse.

Perceived Future of Native-owned Wineries

Research Question 3 was addressed through statistical analysis of Hypothesis 5, and qualitative exploration of the perceived future in the categories of potential negatives, wine and the market, tribal considerations, and educational outreach.

Hypothesis 5. One-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationships between each of the viability variables and the average perceived barrier and benefit scores. The independent variables used were 1) perceived viability of a tribally operated winery in MY tribe and 2) perceived viability of a tribally operated winery in tribes OTHER than my own. The dependent variables were the average perceived barrier score and average perceived benefit score. For Hypothesis 5A, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for their OWN tribe and their average perceived barrier score. The ANOVA was significant, and post hoc comparisons suggest those who Strongly Agree that a tribally operated winery is a viable business enterprise for their tribe have a significantly lower perception of barriers to entry than do those who Strongly Disagree that a winery would be a viable business opportunity. For Hypothesis 5B, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for their OWN tribe and their average perceived benefit score. The ANOVA was significant, and post hoc comparisons suggest significant differences in average perceived benefit scores between Strongly Agree and Agree ($p = .003$), Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed ($p < .001$), Strongly Agree and Disagree ($p = .007$), and Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree ($p < .001$). As respondents felt more positively about the viability of a winery operation in their tribe, their average perception of the benefits of winery operation increased significantly. Mean ratings for perceived viability and average perception of benefits increased with each level from Strongly

Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Results of Hypothesis 5A showed a relationship between respondents' perception of the future viability of a winery in their own tribe and their perception of barriers to entry into the industry. This matches the expectations of the researcher, in that those who believed tribally operated wineries were more viable also perceived fewer barriers to their inception. Similarly, Hypothesis 5B suggested that as respondents rated the viability of a winery in their tribe more highly, their perception of the benefits a winery would provide also increased. This makes sense, because the level of optimism that leads to a higher perception of viability is likely related to their ability to consider the available benefits.

For Hypothesis 5C, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability of a winery operation for OTHER tribes and their average perceived barrier score. The ANOVA suggested that there were significant differences between participants' perceived viability of a winery operation for tribes OTHER than their own and their average perceived barrier scores. While the model was found to be significant, heterogeneous variances lead to the possibility that the F statistic is biased by the mixing of large and small sample groups. As a result, the significance of the model can be underestimated, causing a significant result when no differences actually exist. For Hypothesis 5D, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between participants' perceived viability for OTHER tribes and their average perceived benefit score. The ANOVA was significant, and post hoc comparisons suggest significant differences between Strongly Agree and Agree ($p = .001$) and Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed ($p < .001$).

No statistically significant relationship was found for 5C among the pairings for perceived viability, although the model was significant. This could be due to the presence of

heterogeneous variables and/or potentially one or more outliers among the groups that affected the distributions. For 5D, as respondents felt more positively about the viability of a winery operation for other tribes, their average perception of the benefits of winery operation increased. This increase was significant between the categories of Strongly Agree and Agree, and Strongly Agree and Unsure/Mixed.

Qualitative Analysis. Qualitative analysis of the perceived future of Native-owned wineries is divided into the categories of potential negatives, wine and the market, and tribal considerations. The potential negative outcomes discussed by respondents involved reinforcing or triggering alcohol-dependent behavior in their at-risk populations. Additionally, one respondent's tribe had been used as slaves in the original stringing and planting of wineries in her area, so she did not see a future in winery operation that could be pursued with integrity based on her tribe's difficult history. Additionally, tribes with casinos have had the experience of beginning a controversial enterprise, and this experience will likely color members' opinions of future business endeavors.

Respondents also considered the length of time that it takes to turn a profit in the wine industry, from planting and growing grapes to figuring out the best practices for a successful and marketable product. Since respondents perceived that tribes are used to the "instant gratification of casinos," generating income in a long-term investment would be difficult to communicate to the membership as they expect a quicker return on the tribe's investment. Respondents also discussed the strength of the US wine market, and felt that as long as it was doing well, a tribal operation would also flourish.

Several respondents felt that a tribally operated winery would a viable opportunity that would provide several benefits to their tribes, including increased revenue and the creation of

jobs for tribal members. Strategic planning was seen as important to a tribally operated winery's success, as public perception of such an endeavor was described as a challenge. Additionally, social resistance within the tribe would require education to aid in understanding how a winery can be an important part of the tribal economy without detracting from a healthy membership.

Conclusions

Strengths

As tribes experience concerns about market maturation, slowed growth, increased competition, and market saturation in the gaming industry (Wilson, 2013; Freiss, 2015; Meister, 2015), decision makers are looking to other options to provide support to their memberships. The United States wine industry has enjoyed consistent sales growth, slowed only during the economic recession of 2008 and 2009 (Statista, 2016), and as a result some tribes have slowly pursued enterprises in this area. As the present research demonstrates, this is still a new and novel idea to many tribal members in the US.

Self-determination, a concept identified as integral to tribal business operations in current literature, and self-preservation lead tribes toward increased autonomy and cultural revitalization. The function of these goals is supported by both federally available grants and income from tribal businesses. The grants are largely maintained by allocated funding from the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, but tribal business can take many forms. One of the benefits discussed in the interviews was the importance of preserving both the environment and tribal heritage in conducting business. To this end, winery operation was seen as a potential avenue that would not require land to become part of housing or retail developments, and could potentially be supported by federal grants for funding.

When examining Native-owned wineries, it will be necessary to identify their business model and how that might relate to the role these wineries play in both tribal infrastructure and the general North American wine industry. Based on respondents' assertion that a benefit of tribal wineries would be to support other tribal hospitality enterprises, it is likely that these business structures within the wine industry would be categorized as "Lone Rangers" (Castaldi et

al, 2005). This is because they will likely operate with a single location within each tribe.

The strengths that arose in the present research echo those identified in the tribal populations interviewed by Reed (2013). Respondents perceived that revenue, job creation, support for other tribal enterprises, and the preservation of tribal heritage as potential benefits for winery operation. These concepts were identified as important goals for new business endeavors, as tribes seek to create a “business enterprise structure that encourages entrepreneurship and allows the tribe to take advantage of business opportunities without sacrificing cultural values” (Reed, 2013, pg. 132). The connection that winery operation could provide between members was seen as a strength to this business concept by respondents in the current research.

Challenges

A theme that arose in the course of this research was the “old versus new” concept within tribes. More traditional members tended to be leery of new pursuits without a solid amount of evidence that it would be an appropriate and successful endeavor. Upholding the integrity of the tribe is of utmost importance in these considerations, and it was difficult for some to consider an alcohol-based enterprise because of the potential effect on their at-risk members. Based on acculturation level, this study found that more traditional members of the tribe had a higher perception of the barriers likely to exist in winery operation. Each individual tribe’s challenge will be to communicate effectively to all tribe members.

The realities of Native American tribal members’ experience a generation ago – the incidence of poverty, disease, and cultural disintegration – are always a consideration (Garrigues, 2012). The challenges of balancing between former members’ experiences and the newer diversification opportunities are very much on the minds of tribal members as they undertake wine-related ventures (Kettman, 2013). The present research suggests that these experiences in

some tribes are not as far distant as previous research advises. For this reason, this challenge must be actively addressed if winery operation is considered.

Marketing a tribally produced wine product was seen as a contentious prospect, with sacred objects, animals, and icons seen as inappropriate for use. Of additional interest to the present research agenda concerning the marketing of Native-owned winery products, Boudreaux and Palmer examined images on wine labels and how they related to purchase intent. The findings were that “image alone was responsible for an increase of 0.85 in purchase intent score (on the seven-point scale) from the least desirable images (the unusual animals) to the most-desirable images (grape motifs)” (Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007, p. 177). These findings indicate that while the present research concerning meaningful Native American imagery on wine labels in the animal category may not have scored as inappropriate on the quantitative measure, they should still be carefully considered in the context of effective wine marketing strategies.

A large collection of recent research also examines authenticity in winery operations, with perceived authenticity being the most important in the current context and a potentially powerful barrier to successful winery operation (Kim & Bon, 2016; Robinson & Clifford, 2012). This topic arose in respondents’ discussion of winery operation as not being a pursuit where tribes bring credibility based on their historic pursuits or heritage.

Opportunities

The role of agriculture in preservation was seen not only in importance to the land itself, but in the connections that tribal members are able to sustain with each other through communal work. The agricultural jobs potentially provided by a winery operation were seen as a method through which younger generations could find work without leaving the geographic area, thereby maintaining tribal strength. For Native-owned wineries, it is possible that both passion and

revenue could be motivating factors for the businesses due to the tribal reliance on diversified generation of revenue to fund tribal social structures and a connection to tribal lands, i.e. they could operate for love and for money (Podolny, 2002).

Since tribes provide infrastructure improvements, educational opportunities, and social programs through the revenue produced by gaming, per the IGRA (Robertson, 2012), it is integral that funds continue to come in for these provisions. Fullmer (2013) recommends that, to successfully grow and diversify, leaders should “engage in critical deliberations about what kind of society they have now and what they’re hoping to have in the future.” The opportunity exists for a tribally operated winery to fill these needs if the potential barriers are addressed early and thoroughly in strategic planning.

Recommendations

The results of this research provide a framework for consideration of the potential strengths, challenges, and opportunities provided by tribal winery operation. The perspectives represented within are of members of non-involved tribes, so they reflect the issues that could be expected in a new tribe considering this diversification option. In general, the most important repeated acknowledgement is that the information should be used on a tribe-by-tribe basis, as there is no one-size-fits all approach.

Future research conducted by tribes can address the topics identified in this research with their own membership to build a picture of the specific strengths, challenges, and opportunities that are likely to exist. Careful consideration of the resources available within the tribe should directly impact considerations of winery operation, as supporting current tribal enterprises was a primary benefit identified in this research. When pieces of the tribes' businesses can support each other, the benefits could flow in both directions.

Education and outreach should be important pieces of tribes' strategic plans in pursuing winery operation. Within the tribe, the social resistance encountered could potentially be mitigated by assuaging fears of increased alcoholism and other negative consequences of embracing an alcohol-based enterprise through education and clear, effective communication. For individuals outside of the tribe, stereotyping of Native Americans in the modern era as primitive or abusive drinkers must also be addressed through outreach and education. These perceptions should also be addressed by making conscious marketing decisions that do not commodify Native American culture or reinforce the commonly encountered stereotypes.

Future research into this topic will benefit from a larger sample size with more representation across demographic areas so that there is an increased opportunity for statistically

significant relationships to develop. Specifically, improved representation across different age groups would be valuable. Finding a way to secure participation by tribal members who identify as Traditional and Marginal on the acculturation measure would provide additional insight into the experience and perceptions of a more representative sample of tribal participants. Identifying connections in more tribes across the United States to serve as key connectors for dissemination of the survey could potentially increase the reach and response rates, as well. Potential future research in this area should seek to isolate and deeply explore the key insights addressed in this research.

Finally, it would be valuable to recruit representatives from tribes who are currently involved in the wine industry to examine their perspectives on the same issues. Representatives of Native-owned wineries could provide valuable insight into the actual benefits and barriers of operation and give insight into the issue of marketing a tribal winery product.

References

- APHIS: Partnering across nations to safeguard Native American agriculture. (2012). Retrieved from https://permanent.access.gpo.gov/gpo48373/native_partnering.pdf
- Atkin, T.S. & Newton, S.K. (2012). Consumer awareness and quality perceptions: a case for Sonoma County wines. *Journal of Wine Research*, 23(2), 155-171.
- Barber, N. & Almanza, B.A. (2006). Influence of wine packaging on consumers' decision to purchase. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 9(4), 83-98.
- Barber, N., Almanza, B., & Dodd, T. (2008). Relationship of wine consumers' self-confidence, product involvement, and packaging cues. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 11(1), 45-64.
- Barber, N., Ismail, J., & Taylor, C. (2007). Label fluency and consumer self-confidence. *Journal of Wine Research*, 18(2), 73-85.
- Bentley, A. (2013). Alcohol: It's different for Native Americans. Native American / American Indian Blog by Partnership with Native Americans. Retrieved January 16, 2016, from <http://blog.nativepartnership.org/alcohol-its-different-for-native-americans/>
- Boudreaux, C.A. & Palmer, S.E. (2007). A charming little Cabernet: Effects of wine label design on purchase intent and brand personality. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 19(3), 170-186.
- Carmines, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Charmez, K. (2003). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds), *Strategies for qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed., pp 249-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chrea, C., Melo, L., Evans, G., Forde, C., Delahunty, C., & Cox, D.N. (2011). An investigation using three approaches to understand the influence of extrinsic product cues on consumer behavior: An example of Australian wines. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 26, 13-24.
- Cherokee Nation. (2017). Retrieved February 17, 2017, from <http://cherokee.org/>
- Churchill, G.E. (2001). *Basic marketing research* (6th ed). Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

- Cobanoglu, C. (2001). *Analysis of business travelers' hotel selection and satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.
- Council for Native American Farming and Ranching. (2017). Retrieved February 20, 2017, from <https://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentidonly=true&contentid=otr-council-native-american-farming-ranching.html>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Friess, S. (2015, October 23). Indian tribes look beyond casinos for income. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/24/business/indian-tribes-look-beyond-casinos-for-income.html>
- Fullmer, J. (2013). Tribal strength through economic diversification. Retrieved December 12, 2016, from <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2013/04/18/tribal-strength-through-economic-diversification>.
- Gabbard, D. (2015). Our story. Retrieved from <http://www.nativevineswinery.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=browse&id=643849&pageid=24>
- Garrett, M. & Pichette, E. (2000). Red as an apple: Native American acculturation and counseling with or without reservation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(1), 3-13.
- Garrigues, Lisa Gale. (2012, July 11). Featuring a cask of thousands: Four California tribes are leading the Native way into the wine business. Retrieved February 8, 2016, from <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/07/11/featuring-cask-thousands-four-california-tribes-are-leading-native-way-wine-business>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1968). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine pub.
- Hammond, R., Sydnor, S., & Kang, E. (2014). Reaching an underserved wine customer: Connecting with the African American wine consumer. *FIU Hospitality Review*, 31(3), 118–144.
- Holyoke, L.-S. (2013). Pairing the adult learner and boutique wineries. *Journal of Adult Education*, 42(2), 60–69.

- Illinois Agriculture Begins. (2016). Retrieved February 18, 2017, from http://www.museum.state.il.us/exhibits/agriculture/htmls/people/native/peo_na.html
- K., A. (2016). WaPo's new Redsk*ns survey: Faulty data and missing the point. Retrieved February 18, 2017, from <http://nativeappropriations.com/2016/05/wapos-new-redskns-survey.html>
- Kettmann, Matt. (2013). Tribes take to the vine: Native American vineyards are a growing business. *Wine Spectator*, Retrieved September 24, 2015, from <http://www.winespectator.com/webfeature/show/id/48539>
- Kim, H., & Bonn, M. A. (2016). Authenticity: Do tourist perceptions of winery experiences affect behavioral intentions? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 839–859. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2014-0212>
- Kutler, S. I. (Ed.). (2003). *Dictionary of American history*. New York, NY: Scribner's Sons.
- Pallant, Julie. (2013). *SPSS survival manual* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- McLeod, S. A. (2008). Social identity theory. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html
- Meister, A. (2015). *Casino City's Indian Gaming Industry Report*. Irvine, CA.
- Mihesuah, D. A. (2015). *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities* (1st ed.). Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.
- Miller, R. K. (2015). Part VIII: Ethnic focus Native American consumers overview. *Consumer Behavior*, 11.
- The Multicultural Economy (2010). The Selig Center for Economic Growth at the University of Georgia (www.terry.uga.edu/selig/docs/GBEC0903q.pdf)
- National Conference of State Legislators. (2015). Federal and State Recognized Tribes. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/state-tribalinstitute/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx#State>
- National Congress of American Indians. (2017). Retrieved February 18, 2017, from <http://www.ncai.org/policy-issues/land-natural-resources/agriculture>

- National Indian Gaming Commission. (2014). *Gross Gaming Revenue Trending (In Billions)*. Retrieved from <http://www.nigc.gov/images/uploads/reports/2014GGRTrendingChart.pdf>
- Native Americans speak with one voice against Crazy Horse. (1992). *The Alcoholism Report*, 20(8-9).
- Novello, A. C. (1993). Crazy Horse malt liquor beverage: The public outcry to save the image of a Native American hero. *South Dakota Law Review*, 38, 14.
- Olsen, S. O., Scholderer, J., Brunso, K., & Verbeke, W. (2007). Exploring the relationship between convenience and fish consumption: A cross-cultural study. *Appetite*, 49(1), 84–91.
- Pieniak, Z., Aertsens, J., & Verbeke, W. (2010). Subjective and objective knowledge as determinants of organic vegetables consumption. *Food Quality and Preference*, 21(6), 581–588.
- Pommersheim, F. (2012). The Crazy Horse malt liquor case: From tradition to modernity and halfway back. *South Dakota Law Review*, 57(1).
- Prescott, J., Laing, D. G., Bell, G., Yoshida, M., Gillmore, R., Allen, S., Ishii, R. (1992). Hedonic responses to taste solutions: A cross-cultural study of Japanese and Australians. *Chemical Senses*, 17(6), 801–809. <http://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/17.6.801>
- Reed, M. K. (2013). *Tribal enterprises versus tribal values: An exploratory qualitative inquiry*. Capella University, United States. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/1423625870/abstract/94D7B313E928445FPQ/1>
- Red-Horse, V. (2006). American Indian gaming fuels opportunities for hospitality industry. *Hotel Online Special Report*. Retrieved from http://www.hotel-online.com/News/PR2006_2nd/Jun06_IndianGaming.html
- Reynaud, E., & Simon, E. (2006). The secrets of a good winery: Core competences. *British Food Journal*, 108(4), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700610657100>
- Robertson, Dwanna. (2012). The Myth of Indian Casino Riches. Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/06/23/myth-indian-casino-riches>
- Robinson, R., & Clifford, C. (2012). Authenticity and festival foodservice experiences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 571–600.

- Rocchi, B. & Stefani, G. (2005). Consumers' perception of wine packaging: A case study. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 18(1), 33-44.
- Stevens, Jr., E. (2015). Indian Gaming: Misconception vs. Fact (NIGA Report). National Indian Gaming Association. Retrieved from http://www.indiangaming.com/istore/May15_Stevens.pdf
- Sparks, P., & Guthrie, C. A. (1998). Self-identity and the theory of planned behavior: A useful addition or an unhelpful artifice? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), 1393–1410. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01683.x>
- Stayman, D. M., & Batra, R. (1991). Encoding and retrieval of ad affect in memory. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, 28(2), 232–239.
- Stevenson, T. (2011). *The Sotheby's Wine Encyclopedia* (5th ed.). New York, N.Y.: DK Publishing.
- Talahongva, P. (2014). Native wineries take root. *Native Peoples Magazine*.
- U.S. Census Bureau, (2014). American FactFinder - Results. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_14_1YR_S0201&prodType=table
- Velikova, N., Wilkinson, K. T., & Harp, S. S. (2016). Reaching the U.S. Hispanic wine market: Highlighting the opportunities. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 22(1), 43–64.
- Where the Casino Money Goes* (Rep. FY2015). (2016, September). Retrieved <http://wherethecasinomoneygoes.com/images/fall16.pdf>
- Wilson, C. (2012). Native American Tribes Venture Out Of Casino Business. Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://www.npr.org/2013/02/21/172630938/native-american-tribes-venture-out-of-casino-business>.
- Wine industry in the U.S. - sales growth 2015 | Statistic. (2016). Retrieved February 10, 2016, from <http://www.statista.com/statistics/209166/us-wine-industrys-sales-growth/>

APPENDIX A

PHASE I IRB APPROVAL



February 1, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Randi Combs
Kelly Way

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 17-01-385

Protocol Title: *Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises*

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 01/31/2017 Expiration Date: 01/30/2018

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (<https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rsop/index.php>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 200 participants. If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

Participant Recruitment Email (Body also used for Social Media post)

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Randi Combs, and I am a PhD candidate at the University of Arkansas under the supervision of Human Nutrition and Hospitality Innovations professor, Dr. Kelly Way. In fulfillment of my educational requirements, I am currently recruiting for my dissertation study. In this research, I will be examining tribal members' perceptions of tribal winery operation, including perceptions of the benefits, challenges, and opportunities that the operation may provide. If you are interested in participating by filling out a 15-20 minute survey, please follow the link below or contact me at Rcomweave@uark.edu or (479)957-8524.

Link to survey: [Http.....com](http://.....com)

Thank you,

Randi M. Combs, PhD Candidate
University of Arkansas

Supervising Faculty:
Kelly A. Way, PhD
University of Arkansas
Kway@uark.edu

IRB #17-01-385
Approved: 01/31/2017
Expires: 01/30/2018

Consent Form

Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises

Principal Researcher: Randi M. Combs
Faculty Advisor: Kelly Way

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

You are invited to participate in a research study about tribal winery operation.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE RESEARCH STUDY

Who is the Principal Researcher?

Randi M. Combs
rmweave@uark.edu
479-957-8524

Who is the Faculty Advisor?

Dr. Kelly Way
kway@uark.edu
479-575-4985

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation.

Who will participate in this study?

Individuals who self-identify as being of Native American descent.

What am I being asked to do?

Participants will complete a 15-20 minute online survey that includes demographic information, a Native American acculturation measure, and questions regarding their opinion of tribal winery operation. Participants willing to participate in future planned research on this study will have the opportunity to provide their name and phone number for a follow up interview at a later time.

What are the possible risks or discomforts?

There are no anticipated risks involved in this study.

What are the possible benefits of this study?

Participants will be entered into a drawing to win a \$50 Walmart gift card.

Will I have to pay for anything?

There will be no cost associated with participation in this study.

What are the options if I do not want to be in the study?

If you do not want to be in this study, you may refuse to participate. Also, you may refuse to participate at any time during the study. Your job and your relationship with the University will not be affected in any way if you refuse to participate.

IRB #17-01-385
Approved: 01/31/2017
Expires: 01/30/2018

How will my confidentiality be protected?

All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by applicable State and Federal law. Survey responses will not record any identifying information.

Will I know the results of the study?

At the conclusion of the study you will have the right to request feedback about the results. You may contact the faculty advisor, Kelly Way (479-575-4985), or Principal Researcher, Randi M. Combs (479-957-8524). You will receive a copy of this form for your files.

What do I do if I have questions about the research study?

You have the right to contact the Principal Researcher or Faculty Advisor as listed below for any concerns that you may have.

Randi M. Combs
rmweave@uark.edu
479-957-8524

Dr. Kelly Way
kway@uark.edu
479-575-4985

You may also contact the University of Arkansas Research Compliance office listed below if you have questions about your rights as a participant, or to discuss any concerns about, or problems with the research.

Ro Windwalker, CIP
Institutional Review Board Coordinator
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
109 MLKG Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu

I have read the above statement and have been able to ask questions and express concerns, which have been satisfactorily responded to by the investigator. I understand the purpose of the study as well as the potential benefits and risks that are involved. I understand that participation is voluntary. I understand that significant new findings developed during this research will be shared with the participant. By completing this survey, I am agreeing for my responses to be used in this research study.

IRB #17-01-385
Approved: 01/31/2017
Expires: 01/30/2018

APPENDIX B

PHASE I QUALTRICS SURVEY



Consent Form

Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises

Principal Researcher: Randi M. Combs

Faculty Advisor: Kelly Way

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

You are invited to participate in a research study about tribal winery operation.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE RESEARCH STUDY

Who is the Principal Researcher?

Randi M. Combs

rmweave@uark.edu

479-957-8524

Who is the Faculty Advisor?

Dr. Kelly Way

kway@uark.edu

479-575-4985

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of tribal members regarding the strengths, challenges, and opportunities presented by tribal winery operation.

Who will participate in this study?

Individuals who self-identify as being of Native American descent.

What am I being asked to do?

Participants will complete a 15-20 minute online survey that includes demographic information, a Native American acculturation measure, and questions regarding their opinion of tribal winery operation. Participants willing to participate in future planned research on this study will have the opportunity to provide their name and phone number for a follow up interview at a later time.

What are the possible risks or discomforts?

There are no anticipated risks involved in this study.

What are the possible benefits of this study?

Participants will be entered into a drawing to win a \$50 Walmart gift card.

Will I have to pay for anything?

There will be no cost associated with participation in this study.

What are the options if I do not want to be in the study?

If you do not want to be in this study, you may refuse to participate. Also, you may refuse to participate at any time during the study. Your job and your relationship with the University will not be affected in any way if you refuse to participate.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by applicable State and Federal law. Survey responses will not record any identifying information.

Will I know the results of the study?

At the conclusion of the study you will have the right to request feedback about the results. You may contact the faculty advisor, Kelly Way (479-575-4985), or Principal Researcher, Randi M. Combs (479-957-8524). You will receive a copy of this form for your files.

What do I do if I have questions about the research study?

You have the right to contact the Principal Researcher or Faculty Advisor as listed below for any concerns that you may have.

Randi M. Combs
rmweave@uark.edu
479-957-8524

Dr. Kelly Way
kway@uark.edu
479-575-4985

You may also contact the University of Arkansas Research Compliance office listed below if you have questions about your rights as a participant, or to discuss any concerns about, or problems with the research.

Ro Windwalker, CIP
Institutional Review Board Coordinator
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
109 MLKG Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208

I have read the above statement and have been able to ask questions and express concerns, which have been satisfactorily responded to by the investigator. I understand the purpose of the study as well as the potential benefits and risks that are involved. I understand that participation is voluntary. I understand that significant new findings developed during this research will be shared with the participant. By completing this survey, I am agreeing for my responses to be used in this research study.

>>



Demographic Information:

Are you a member/descendant of a Native American or Alaskan Native tribe?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

>>



Which Native American or Alaskan Native tribe(s) do you belong to?

Which of these describe your current living situation:

- ☐ Reservation
- ☐ Allotment Land
- ☐ Tribal Land
- ☐ Other (Please list)

Which state do you currently live in?

Please identify your gender:

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

What is your current age?

- ☐ 18-20
- ☐ 21-25
- ☐ 26-34
- ☐ 35-49
- ☐ 50+

What is your current marital status?

- ☐ Single, never married
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Cohabiting
- ☐ Separated or divorced
- ☐ Widowed

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- ☐ Less than High School
- ☐ High school graduate/GED
- ☐ Associate/Vocational Degree
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ Bachelor's Degree
- ☐ Master's Degree
- ☐ Doctoral Degree
- ☐ Professional Degree (JD, MD)

What is your annual household income?

- ☐ \$19,999 or less
 - ☐ \$20,000 up to \$30,000
 - ☐ \$30,001 up to \$50,000
 - ☐ \$50,001 up to \$75,000
 - ☐ \$75,001 up to \$100,000
 - ☐ More than \$100,000
-

Which of the following best describes your current occupation?

- ☐ Professional
- ☐ Management
- ☐ Clerical
- ☐ Sales
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Military
- ☐ Self-employed or business owner
- ☐ Unemployed
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Retired
- ☐ Other (Please list)

Which of the following best describes your current employment?

- ☐ Tribal organization
- ☐ Federal government
- ☐ State government
- ☐ Private organization
- ☐ Other (Please list)

>>



Native American Acculturation Measure (Garrett & Pichette, 2000)

Please select the response that best fits you.

What language can you speak?

- ☐ Tribal language only (e.g. Cherokee, Navajo, Lakota)
- ☐ Mostly tribal language, some English
- ☐ Tribal language and English about equally well (bilingual)
- ☐ Mostly English, some tribal language
- ☐ English only

What language do you prefer?

- ☐ Tribal language only (e.g. Cherokee, Navajo, Lakota)
- ☐ Mostly tribal language, some English
- ☐ Tribal language and English about equally well (bilingual)
- ☐ Mostly English, some tribal language
- ☐ English only

How do you identify yourself?

- ☐ Native American
 - ☐ Native American and some non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
 - ☐ Native American and non-Native American (bicultural)
 - ☐ Non-Native American and some Native American
 - ☐ Non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
-

Which identification does (did) your mother use?

- ☐ Native American
 - ☐ Native American and some non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
 - ☐ Native American and non-Native American (bicultural)
 - ☐ Non-Native American and some Native American
 - ☐ Non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
-

Which identification does (did) your father use?

- ☐ Native American
 - ☐ Native American and some non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
 - ☐ Native American and non-Native American (bicultural)
 - ☐ Non-Native American and some Native American
 - ☐ Non-Native American (e.g. White, African American, Latino, Asian American)
-

What was the ethnic origin of friends you had as a child up to age of 6?

- ☐ Only Native American
 - ☐ Mostly Native American
 - ☐ About equally Native American and non-Native American
 - ☐ Mostly non-Native American
 - ☐ Only non-Native American
-

What was the ethnic origin of friends you had as a child ages 6 to 18?

- ☐ Only Native American
- ☐ Mostly Native American
- ☐ About equally Native American and non-Native American
- ☐ Mostly non-Native American
- ☐ Only non-Native American

Who do you associate with now in your community?

- ☐ Only Native American
 - ☐ Mostly Native American
 - ☐ About equally Native American and non-Native American
 - ☐ Mostly non-Native American
 - ☐ Only non-Native American
-

What music do you prefer?

- ☐ Native American music only (e.g. pow-wow music, traditional flute, contemporary, and chant)
 - ☐ Mostly Native American music
 - ☐ Equally Native American and other music
 - ☐ Mostly other music (e.g. rock, pop, country, and rap)
 - ☐ Other music only
-

What movies do you prefer?

- ☐ Native American movies only
 - ☐ Mostly Native American movies
 - ☐ Equally Native American and other movies
 - ☐ Mostly other movies
 - ☐ Other movies only
-

Where were you born?

- ☐ Reservation, Native American community
- ☐ Rural area, Native American community
- ☐ Urban area, Native American community
- ☐ Urban or Rural area, near Native American community
- ☐ Urban or Rural area, away from Native American community

Where were you raised?

- ☐ Reservation, Native American community
 - ☐ Rural area, Native American community
 - ☐ Urban area, Native American community
 - ☐ Urban or Rural area, near Native American community
 - ☐ Urban or Rural area, away from Native American community
-

What contact have you had with Native American communities?

- ☐ Raised for 1 year or more on the reservation or in a Native American community
 - ☐ Raised for 1 year or less on the reservation or in a Native American community
 - ☐ Occasional visits to the reservation or other Native American community
 - ☐ Occasional communications with people on reservations or other Native American community
 - ☐ No exposure or communications with people on reservation or other Native American community
-

What foods do you prefer?

- ☐ Native American foods only
 - ☐ Mostly Native American foods and some other foods
 - ☐ About equally Native American foods and other foods
 - ☐ Mostly other foods
 - ☐ Other foods only
-

In what language do you think?

- ☐ Tribal language only (e.g. Cherokee, Navajo, Lakota)
- ☐ Mostly tribal language, some English
- ☐ Tribal language and English about equally well (bicultural)
- ☐ Mostly English, some tribal language
- ☐ English only

Do you:

- ☐ Read only a tribal language (e.g. Cherokee, Navajo, Lakota)
 - ☐ Read mostly tribal language, some English
 - ☐ Read tribal language and English about equally well (bilingual)
 - ☐ Read mostly English, some tribal language
 - ☐ Read English only
-

Do you:

- ☐ Write only a tribal language (e.g. Cherokee, Navajo, Lakota)
 - ☐ Write a tribal language better than English
 - ☐ Write both a tribal language and English about equally well
 - ☐ Write English better than a tribal language
 - ☐ Write only English
-

How much pride do you have in Native American culture and heritage?

- ☐ Extremely proud
 - ☐ Moderately proud
 - ☐ A little pride
 - ☐ No pride, but I do not feel negative toward the group
 - ☐ No pride, but I do feel negative toward the group
-

How would you rate yourself?

- ☐ Very Native American
 - ☐ Mostly Native American
 - ☐ Bicultural
 - ☐ Mostly non-Native American
 - ☐ Very non-Native American
-

Do you participate in Native American traditions, ceremonies, occasions, and so on?

- ☐ All of them
- ☐ Most of them
- ☐ Some of them
- ☐ A few of them
- ☐ None at all

>>



This next section includes statements regarding CHALLENGES a tribe might face when considering a winery operation. Please indicate your level of AGREEMENT with each statement.

Do you AGREE or DISAGREE that each of these statements would CHALLENGE your tribe? I.e. Do you agree or disagree that this would be a problem?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure, Mixed	Agree	Strongly Agree
Learning the winery business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Building a relationship with other wineries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being familiar with business practices well enough to operate a winery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being considered a credible business pursuit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establishing a relationship with a tribal mentor for tribal winery operation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having access to capital (funds, collateral, credit) to start a new business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having access to land to support a tribal winery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being prohibited by land use laws to operate a tribally owned winery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Having a small tribal membership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being a very traditional tribal community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tribal members having religious or spiritual beliefs that are in opposition to winery operation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not contributing to a healthy community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not be considered an appropriate endeavor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





Please indicate the LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE for the following potential BENEFITS of a tribally operated winery.

How IMPORTANT is each of the following potential BENEFITS that a tribally operated winery could bring?

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Critically Important
Bring increased revenue to the tribe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Create jobs for tribal members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide opportunities for community growth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase potential customers for other tribe owned hospitality enterprises	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide opportunities for the preservation of tribal heritage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tie in with current tribal business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide an opportunity to introduce new knowledge to the culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach a new agricultural skill set to tribal members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase opportunities for agricultural tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase opportunities for tribal tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Do you believe the costs outweigh the benefits of a tribal winery operation?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure - Need more information

>>



Please indicate the LEVEL OF APPROPRIATENESS for using the following symbols and icons in marketing a TRIBALLY CONTROLLED winery.

For each statement below, indicate HOW APPROPRIATE it would be for a tribe to market their winery product using the category described.

	Completely Unacceptable	Somewhat Unacceptable	Neither Acceptable Nor Unacceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Completely Acceptable
Geography (examples include historic sites, hills, trees, or other natural formations)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ceremonial dress (examples include headdresses, beadwork, tribal prints, or other wearable items)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Native American historic figures (examples include Chief Crazy Horse, Sacagawea, Sequoyah, or others)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Animals (examples include owls, bears, falcons, buffalo, or others)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Totems (examples include spirit beings, sacred objects, or symbols)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Writing in a tribal language (examples include written language like the Cherokee syllabary and symbolic language such as pictographs)



Meaningful tribal objects (examples include dreamcatchers, peace pipes, teepees or other housing, painted pots or other art, or other items)





Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for MY tribe.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Unsure/Mixed
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Strongly disagree
-

A tribally operated winery might be a viable business opportunity for tribes OTHER than my own.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Unsure/Mixed
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

>>



Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up phone interview lasting 15-20 minutes regarding the results of this survey (not your individual responses)?

☐ Yes (Please enter your name and phone number with area code)

☐ No thank you

Would you like to be entered into the drawing to win a \$50 Walmart gift certificate?

☐ Yes (Please enter your name and phone number with area code)

☐ No thank you

>>



Thank you for participating in this research survey! I sincerely appreciate your time and effort.

>>

APPENDIX C

PHASE 2 IRB APPROVAL



Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

March 6, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Randi Combs
Kelly Way

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: PROJECT MODIFICATION

IRB Protocol #: 17-01-385

Protocol Title: *Exploring Winery Operation as a Diversification Option for Native American Tribal Enterprises*

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 03/03/2017 Expiration Date: 01/30/2018

Your request to modify the referenced protocol has been approved by the IRB. **This protocol is currently approved for 220 total participants.** If you wish to make any further modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

Please note that this approval does not extend the Approved Project Period. Should you wish to extend your project beyond the current expiration date, you must submit a request for continuation using the UAF IRB form "Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects." The request should be sent to the IRB Coordinator, 109 MLKG Building.

For protocols requiring FULL IRB review, please submit your request at least one month prior to the current expiration date. (High-risk protocols may require even more time for approval.) For protocols requiring an EXPEDITED or EXEMPT review, submit your request at least two weeks prior to the current expiration date. Failure to obtain approval for a continuation *on or prior to* the currently approved expiration date will result in termination of the protocol and you will be required to submit a new protocol to the IRB before continuing the project. Data collected past the protocol expiration date may need to be eliminated from the dataset should you wish to publish. Only data collected under a currently approved protocol can be certified by the IRB for any purpose.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

APPENDIX D

PHASE 2 NON-INVOLVED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Hello! My name is Randi Combs, and I am a PhD candidate at the University of Arkansas. I am calling today because you indicated in my online survey that you would be willing to participate in a follow-up phone interview concerning my research about Native American winery operation. I am calling to discuss the results of the survey, but NOT your specific responses, which were recorded anonymously and separate from your contact information.

If you still agree to participate, I will ask you a series of questions related to the original survey content. At no time will your name or any identifying information be included in this interview transcript. Participation is completely voluntary, and you may skip questions or stop the interview at any time.

Do you have any questions about me, my research, or our interview before we begin?

If you have any questions at a later time, my supervising faculty member, Dr. Way can be contacted at the University of Arkansas by phone at (479) 575-4985 or by email at Kway@uark.edu. If you have any concerns or complaints, you may contact our Institutional Review Board by phone at (479) 575-2208 or by email at irb@uark.edu.

Are you ready to begin?

I am going to ask individually about 4 traits. Please respond with a "YES" if I may use that information when writing up the results of these interviews, or with "NO" if I may not use that information when writing up the results of these interviews. No additional identifying information will be used.

May I use your:

- Gender
- Age
- State of Residence
- Tribal Affiliation

Great thank you! Now we can get to the interview. First, let's talk about perceptions of tribally owned wineries.

Q1: Do you have any experience with or knowledge of tribally operated wineries? Can you describe it to me?

Q2: Overall, would you characterize your opinion of tribally-operated wineries as positive, neutral, or negative? Can you give me some background and context to this opinion? Such as, personal experience or knowledge, the stories of others, news/media, etc.

Q3: What challenges do you believe a tribe would face when considering these options?

IRB #17-01-385
Approved: 03/03/2017
Expires: 01/30/2018

Q3a: How significant would these challenges be? I.e. Insurmountable, trivial, or somewhere in between

Q4: Can you describe any important benefits to the tribe that a tribally operated winery could provide?

Q4a: Can you describe another business venture that you believe would better serve the tribe in providing these benefits?

Q5: Can you describe to me any circumstances in your tribe would make a tribally operated winery a worthwhile business venture?

Q5a: Can you describe for me any circumstances in **other** tribes would make a tribally operated winery a worthwhile business venture?

Thank you! Next, I would like to ask some questions about the appropriateness of the marketing categories that appeared on the survey. The survey found that only the category Totems (for example spirit beings, sacred objects, or symbols) was perceived as unacceptable. Each other category scored as neutral on the scale. I would like for us to talk about your perception of each category.

Q6: The first category was geography. Examples include historic sites, hills, trees, or other natural formations.

Q6a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting meaningful geographical locations might be considered acceptable?

Q6b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q7: The next category is ceremonial dress. Examples include headdresses, beadwork, tribal prints, or other wearable items.

Q7a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting ceremonial dress might be considered acceptable?

Q7b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q8: The next category is Native American historic figures. Examples include Chief Crazy Horse, Sacagawea, Sequoyah, or others.

Q8a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting Native American historic figures might be considered acceptable?

Q8b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q9: The next category is animals. Examples include owls, bears, falcons, buffalo, or others.

Q9a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting animals might be considered acceptable?

Q9b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q10: The next category is Totems. Examples include spirit beings, sacred objects, or symbols.

Q10a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting totems might be considered acceptable?

Q10b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q11: The next category is writing in a tribal language. Examples include written language such as the Cherokee syllabary and symbolic language such as pictographs.

Q11a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting writing in a tribal language might be considered acceptable?

Q11b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

Q12: The final category is meaningful tribal objects. Examples include dreamcatchers, peace pipes, teepees or other housing, painted pots or other art, or other items.

Q12a: Why do you believe tribal winery products depicting meaningful tribal objects might be considered acceptable?

Q12b: And why might it be considered unacceptable?

For our final section, I would like to talk about the perceived future of tribally operated wineries.

Q13: What is your perception of the future of tribally operated wineries? (I.e. Do you predict industry growth, that they will remain in only certain parts of the country, or that the concept will decline?)

Q13a: Why do you believe this is the case?

Q14: Can you describe any circumstances might change that prediction?

Q15: What final thoughts would you like to share?

Thank you so much for participating in this interview! Please feel free to contact me or my advisor at the phone number/email addresses provided at the beginning of the call if you have any questions about my research at a later time.